THEOLOGICAL DICTIONARY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

Edited by
G. Johannes Botterweck
Helmer Ringgren

VOLUME I

THEOLOGICAL DICTIONARY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

COPYRIGHT © 1974 BY WILLIAM B. EERDMANS PUBLISHING CO.
All rights reserved
Revised edition 1977
Translated from
THEOLOGISCHES WÖRTERBUCH ZUM ALTEN TESTAMENT
Lieferungen 1-4
Published 1970, 1971, 1972 by
VERLAG W. KOHLHAMMER GMBH STUTTGART, W. GERMANY

Reprinted 1997

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

Botterweck, G Johannes.
Theological dictionary of the Old Testament.

Translation of Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament.
1. Bible. O. T.—Dictionaries—Hebrew.
2. Hebrew language—Dictionaries—English.
I. Ringgren, Helmer, 1917– joint author.
II. Title.

BS440.B5713 221.3 73-76170
ISBN 0–8028–2325–4

Printed in the United States of America

Матеріал, захищений авторським правом

CONTENTS

Page

Editors' Preface v

Contributors v

Abbreviations xi

Transliteration xx

אָב *'ābh ['āḇ]* **father** (Ringgren) 1

אָבַד *'ābhadh ['āḇaḏ];* אֲבֵדָה; אֲבַדָּן; אֲבַדּוֹן **perish, destroy** (Otzen) 19

אָבָה *'ābhāh ['āḇâ]* **show intention** (B. Johnson) 24

אֶבְיוֹן *'ebhyôn ['eḇyôn]* **poor** (Botterweck) 27

אָבִיר *'ābhîr ['āḇîr];* אֲבִי **strong; Mighty One** (Kapelrud) 42

אָבַל *'ābhal ['āḇal];* אֵבֶל; אֲבֵל **mourn** (Baumann) 44

אֶבֶן *'ebhen ['eḇen]* **stone** (Kapelrud) 48

אַבְרָהָם *'abhrāhām ['aḇrāhām]* **Abraham** (Clements) 52

אָדוֹן *'ādhôn ['āḏôn];* אֲדֹנָי **lord. the Lord** (Eissfeldt†) 59

אַדִּיר *'addîr;* אַדֶּרֶת **mighty** (Ahlström) 73

אָדָם *'ādhām ['āḏām]* **man(kind), Adam** (Maass) 75

אֲדָמָה *'ᵃdhāmāh ['ᵃḏāmâ]* **land** (Plöger) 88

אָהַב *'āhabh ['āhaḇ];* אַהֲבָה; אֵהֵב; אֹהֵב **love** (Wallis; Bergman, Haldar) 99

אֹהֶל *'ōhel;* אָהֳלָה **tent** (Koch) 118

אוֹב *'ōbh ['ōḇ]* **pit; spirit; necromancer** (Hoffner) 130

אָוָה *'āvāh ['āwâ];* אִוָּה (הִוָּה); תַּאֲוָה; מַאֲוַיִּים **desire** (G. Mayer) 134

אָוִיל *'ᵉvîl ['ᵉwîl];* אִוֶּלֶת **fool, foolish** (Cazelles) 137

אָוֶן *'āven ['āwen];* פֹּעֲלֵי אָוֶן **negative power; evildoers** (Bernhardt) 140

אוֹר *'ôr* **light** (Aalen) 147

אוֹת *'ôth ['ôṯ]* **sign** (Helfmeyer) 167

אָח *'āch ['āḥ];* אָחוֹת **brother; sister** (Ringgren) 188

אֶחָד *'echādh ['eḥāḏ]* **one** (Lohfink; Bergman) 193

אַחֵר *'achēr ['aḥēr]* **other** (Erlandsson) 201

אַחֲרֵי *'ach^{a}rê ['aḥ^{a}rê]* **after** (Helfmeyer) 204

אַחֲרִית *'ach^{a}rîth ['aḥ^{a}rîṯ]* **after(wards); end; last** (Seebass) 207

אָיַב *'āyabh ['āyaḇ];* אוֹיֵב; אֵיבָה **enemy** (Ringgren) 212

אֵימָה *'êmāh ['êmâ];* אֵימָתָן; אֵימִים **terror** (Zobel) 219

אִישׁ *'îsh ['îš];* אִשָּׁה **man; woman** (Bratsiotis) 222

אָכַל *'ākhal ['āḵal];* אֹכֶל; אָכְלָה; אֲכִילָה; מַאֲכָל; מַאֲכָל; מַאֲכֶלֶת; מַאֲכֹלֶת **eat, food** (Ottosson) 236

אֵל *'ēl* **El, god** (Cross) 242

אָלָה *'ālāh ['ālâ];* אָלָה; תַּאֲלָה **curse** (Scharbert) 261

אֱלֹהִים *'^{e}lōhîm* **god; God** (Ringgren) 267

אֱלִיל *'^{e}lîl* **worthless thing** (Preuss) 285

אַלְמָנָה *'almānāh ['almānâ];* אַלְמָנוּת **widow** (Hoffner) 287

אָמַן *'ānan;* אֱמוּנָה; אֶמֶן; אֱמֶת **(be) faithful, believe; truth** (Jepsen) 292

אָמַץ *'āmats ['āmaṣ];* אֹמֶץ; אַמָּצָה; אַמִּיץ; מַאֲמָץ **be strong** (Schreiner) 323

אָמַר *'āmar;* אֹמֶר; אֵמֶר; אִמְרָה; אֲמָרָה; מַאֲמָר; מֵאמַר **say** (Wagner) 328

אֱנוֹשׁ *'^{e}nôsh ['^{e}nôš]* **mankind** (Maass) 345

אָנַף *'ānaph ['ānaṗ];* אַף **anger** (E. Johnson) 348

אפס *'ps;* אֶפֶס **end** (Hamp) 361

אֲרוֹן *'^{a}rôn* **ark** (Zobel) 363

אֲרִי *'^{a}rî;* אַרְיֵה; גּוּר; קְפִיר; לָבִיא; לַיִשׁ; שַׁחַל **lion** (Botterweck) 374

אֶרֶץ *'erets ['ereṣ]* **land** (Ottosson; Bergman) 388

ארר *'rr;* מְאֵרָה **curse** (Scharbert) 405

אֵשׁ *'ēsh ['ēš];* אִשָּׁה **fire** (Hamp; Bergman, Krecher) 418

אָשַׁם *'āshām ['āšām];* אָשָׁם; אָשָׁם; אַשְׁמָה **sin, be guilty** (Kellermann) 429

אֲשֵׁרָה *'^{a}shērāh ['^{a}šērâ]* **Asherah** (De Moor) 438

אַשְׁרֵי *blessed* (Cazelles) 445

אֵת *'ēth ['ēṯ];* עִם **with** (Preuss) 449

בְּאֵר *b^{e}'ēr;* בּוֹר **well** (Heintz) 463

בָּבֶל *bābhel [bāḇel]* **Babel** (Ringgren) 466

בָּגַד *bāghadh [bāgaḏ];* בֶּגֶד **act faithlessly** (Erlandsson) 470

בָּדָד *bādhādh [bāḏāḏ];* בַּד; בָּדָד **alone** (Zobel) 473

ABBREVIATIONS

AANLR	*Atti dell'Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, Rendiconti*
AASOR	*Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research*
AB	*The Anchor Bible*
ABAW	*Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften,* Berlin
ABL	R. F. Harper, *Assyrian and Babylonian Letters,* 1-14, Chicago, 1892-1914
ABR	*Australian Biblical Review,* Melbourne
ABRT	J. Craig, *Assyrian and Babylonian Religious Texts,* Leipzig, 1895-97
abs.	absolute
acc.	accusative
AcOr	*Acta Orientalia*
act.	active
adj.	adjective
adv.	adverb
ÄF	*Ägyptologische Forschungen,* Glückstadt
AfK	*Archiv für Kulturgeschichte*
AFNW	*Arbeitsgemeinschaft für Forschung des Landes Nordrhein-Westfalen*
AfO	*Archiv für Orientforschung*
ÄgAbh	*Ägyptologische Abhandlungen*
AH	*Analecta Hymnica,* ed. G. Dreves and C. Blume, Leipzig, 1886-1922
AHAW	*Abhandlungen der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften*
AHDO	*Archives d'Histoire du Droit Oriental*
AHw	W. von Soden, *Akkadisches Handwörterbuch*
AION	*Annali dell'Istituto Universitario Orientale di Napoli*
AJA	*American Journal of Archaeology*
AJSL	*The American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures*
Akk.	Akkadian
AKM	*Abhandlungen zur Kunde des Morgenlandes* (Leipzig), Wiesbaden
AN	J. J. Stamm, *Die akkadische Namengebung. MVÄG,* 44 (1939)
AnAcScFen	*Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae*
AnAeg	*Analecta Aegyptiaca*
AnBibl	*Analecta Biblica,* Rome
AncIsr	R. de Vaux, *Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institutions,* trans. 1961
ANEP	*The Ancient Near East in Pictures,* ed. J. B. Pritchard, Princeton, 1954, ^{2}1969
ANET	*Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament,* ed. J. B. Pritchard, ^{2}1955, ^{3}1969
AnOr	*Analecta Orientalia*
AnSt	*Anatolian Studies,* London
ANVAO	*Avhandlinger utgitt av det Norske Videnskaps-Akademi i Oslo*
AO	*Der Alte Orient,* Leipzig
AOAT	*Alter Orient und Altes Testament,* Neukirchen-Vluyn
AOB	*Altorientalische Bilder zum Alten Testament,* ed. H. Gressmann, ^{2}1927
AOT	*Altorientalische Texte zum Alten Testament,* ed. H. Gressmann, ^{2}1926
AP	A. E. Cowley, *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C.,* Oxford, 1923
APAW	*Abhandlungen der Preussische Akademie der Wissenschaften,* Berlin
APNM	H. B. Huffmon, *Amorite Personal Names in the Mari Texts,* Baltimore, 1965
Arab.	Arabic
Aram.	Aramaic
ArbT	*Arbeiten zur Theologie,* Stuttgart
ARM	*Archives Royales de Mari,* Paris
ArOr	*Archiv Orientâlní,* Prague
ARW	*Archiv für Religionswissenschaft,* Leipzig, Berlin
ASAW	*Abhandlungen der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Leipzig*
ASKT	P. Haupt, *Akkadische und Sumerische Keilschrifttexte,* Leipzig, 1882
Assyr.	Assyrian
ASTI	*Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute in Jerusalem,* Leiden
AT	Alte Testament

Material com direitos autorais

ATA	*Alttestamentliche Abhandlungen,* Münster
ATD	*Das Alte Testament Deutsch*
AThANT	*Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments,* Zurich
ATR	*Anglican Theological Review,* Evanston
Aug	*Augustinianum*
AuS	G. Dalman, *Arbeit und Sitte in Palästina,* 1928-1942
BA	*The Biblical Archaeologist,* New Haven
Bab.	Babylonian
BAfO	*Beihefte zur Archiv für Orientforschung*
BAH	*Bibliothèque Archéologique et Historique,* Paris
BASOR	*Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*
BAss	*Beiträge zu Assyriologie*
BBB	*Bonner Biblische Beiträge*
BDB	Brown-Driver-Briggs, *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*
BE	Babylonian Expedition of the University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia
BeO	*Bibbia e Oriente*
BethM	*Beth Mikra*
BETL	*Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium*
BFChTh	*Beiträge zur Förderung Christlicher Theologie,* Gütersloh
BHHW	*Biblisch-Historisches Handwörterbuch,* ed. L. Rost and B. Reicke, 1962ff.
BHK	*Biblia Hebraica,* ed. R. Kittel
BHS	*Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia,* ed. K. Elliger and W. Rudolph, 1968ff.
BHTh	*Beiträge zur Historischen Theologie,* Tübingen
Bibl	*Biblica,* Rome
BiblRes	*Biblical Research*
BietOr	*Biblica et Orientalia*
BiLe	*Bibel und Leben*
BiLi	*Bibel und Liturgie*
BIN	*Babylonian Inscriptions in the Collection of James B. Nies,* New Haven
BiOr	*Bibliotheca Orientalis,* Leiden
BJRL	*Bulletin of the John Rylands Library,* Manchester
BK	*Biblischer Kommentar zum Alten Testament,* ed. M. Noth and H. W. Wolff
BL	*Bibel-Lexikon,* ed. H. Haag
BLA	H. Bauer-P. Leander, *Grammatik des Biblisch-Aramäischen,* 1927
Blachère-Chouémi	R. Blachère-M. Chouémi-C. Denizeau, *Dictionnaire Arabe-Français-Anglais*
BLe	H. Bauer-P. Leander, *Historische Grammatik der hebräischen Sprache,* 1922
BMAP	E. G. Kraeling, *The Brooklyn Museum Aramaic Papyri,* 1953
BMB	*Bulletin du Musée de Beyrouth*
Bo	Unpublished Boğazköy tablets (with catalog number)
BoSt	*Boghazköi Studien*
BOT	*De Boeken van het Oude Testament,* ed. Grossow, van der Ploeg, *et al.*
BRL	K. Galling, *Biblisches Reallexikon,* 1937
BS	*Bibliotheca Sacra,* Dallas
BSAW	*Berichte über die Verhandlungen der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig*
BSGW	*Berichte der Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften*
BSt	*Biblische Studien,* Neukirchen
BT	*The Bible Translator,* London
BThH	*Biblisch-Theologisches Handwörterbuch zur Lutherbibel und zu neueren Übersetzungen,* ed. E. Osterloh and H. Engeland
BuA	B. Meissner, *Babylonien und Assyrien,* I 1920, II 1925
BuK	*Bibel und Kirche*
BVC	*Bible et Vie Chrétienne*
BWA(N)T	*Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten (und Neuen) Testament,* Stuttgart
BWL	W. G. Lambert, *Babylonian Wisdom Literature,* Oxford, 1960

Copyrighted material

BZ	*Biblische Zeitschrift*, Paderborn
BZAW	*Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, Berlin
BZfr	*Biblische Zeitfragen*
BZTS	*Bonner Zeitschrift für Theologie und Seelsorge*
CAD	*The Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*, 1956ff.
CahRB	*Cahiers de la Revue Biblique*
CahTD	*Cahiers du Groupe F. Thureau-Dangin*, I, Paris, 1960
CANES	*Corpus of Ancient Near Eastern Seals in North American Collections*, I, Washington, 1948
CAT	*Commentaire de l'Ancien Testament*
CBQ	*Catholic Biblical Quarterly*
CBSC	*The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges*
CChr	*Corpus Christianorum*, Turnhout
CD A, B	Damascus Document, Manuscript A, B
CH	Codex Hammurabi
ChrÉg	*Chronique d'Égypte*
CIH	*Corpus Inscriptionum Himjariticarum* (=*CIS*, IV)
CIS	*Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum*, 1881ff.
CML	G. R. Driver, *Canaanite Myths and Legends*, Edinburgh, 1956
CollBG	*Collationes Brugenses et Gandavenses*, Gent
comm.	commentary
ComViat	*Communio Viatorum*, Prague
conj.	conjecture
const.	construct
ContiRossini	K. Conti Rossini, *Chrestomathia Arabica meridionalis epigraphica*, 1931
Copt.	Coptic
COT	*Commentaar op het Oude Testament*, ed. G. C. Aalders, Kampen
CRAI	*Comptes-rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres*, Paris
CRRA	*Compte Rendu de . . . Recontre Assyriologique Internationale*
CT	Cuneiform Texts from Babylonian Tablets, etc. in the British Museum, London, 1896ff.
CT	*The Egyptian Coffin Texts*, ed. A. de Buck and A. H. Gardiner, 1935ff.
CTA	A. Herdner, *Corpus des Tablettes en Cunéiformes Alphabétiques Découvertes à Ras Shamra-Ugarit* I/II, Paris, 1963
CTM	*Concordia Theological Monthly*, St. Louis
CultBibl	*Cultura Bíblica*, Segovia
CW	*Die Christliche Welt*
DACL	F. Cabrol-H. Leclercq, *Dictionnaire d'Archéologie Chrétienne et Liturgie*, Paris, 1907ff.
DB	*Dictionnaire de la Bible*
DBS	*Dictionnaire de la Bible, Supplément*, ed. L. Pirot, A. Robert, H. Cazelles, and A. Feuillet, 1928ff.
DISO	Ch. F. Jean-J. Hoftijzer, *Dictionnaire des Inscriptions Sémitiques de l'Ouest*, Leiden, 1965
diss.	dissertation
DissAbs	*Dissertation Abstracts*
DJD	*Discoveries in the Judaean Desert*, 1955ff.
DLZ	*Deutsche Literaturzeitung*
DN	name of a deity
DTT	*Dansk Teologisk Tidsskrift*, Copenhagen
EA	Tell el-Amarna Tablets
EB	*Die Heilige Schrift in deutscher Übersetzung. Echter-Bibel*, Würzburg
EGA	R. M. Boehmer, *Die Entwicklung der Glyptik während der Akkad-Zeit*, Berlin, 1965
Egyp.	Egyptian

Material com direitos autorais

IrishThQ	*Irish Theological Quarterly*, Maynooth
JA	*Journal Asiatique*, Paris
Ja	Enumeration according to A. Jamme (Old South Arabic)
JAOS	*Journal of the American Oriental Society*
JBL	*Journal of Biblical Literature*
JBR	*Journal of Bible and Religion*, Boston
JCS	*Journal of Cuneiform Studies*, New Haven
JEA	*Journal of Egyptian Archaeology*, London
JEOL	*Jaarbericht ... Ex Oriente Lux*, Leiden
JES	*Journal of Ecumenical Studies*
JJS	*Journal of Jewish Studies*, London
JNES	*Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, Chicago
JNWSL	*Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages*
JoPh	*The Journal of Philology*
JPOS	*Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society*, Jerusalem
JQR	*Jewish Quarterly Review*
JR	*Journal of Religion*, Chicago
JRAS	*Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*, London
JRH	*Journal of Religion and Health*
JSOR	*Journal of the Society of Oriental Research*, Toronto
JSS	*Journal of Semitic Studies*, Manchester
JThC	*Journal for Theology and the Church*
JTS	*Journal of Theological Studies*, Oxford
Jud	*Judaica*
K	Tablets in the Kouyunjik collection of the British Museum
KAI	H. Donner-W. Röllig, *Kanaanäische und aramäische Inschriften*, I ^{2}1966, II ^{2}1968, III ^{2}1969
KAR	E. Ebeling, *Keilschrifttexte aus Assur religiösen Inhalts*, 1915-1919.
KAT	*Kommentar zum Alten Testament*, ed. E. Sellin, continued by J. Herrmann
KAV	O. Schroeder, *Keilinschriften aus Assur verschiedenen Inhalts*
KB	*Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek*, ed. B. Schrader
KBL	L. Koehler-W. Baumgartner, *Hebräisches und aramäisches Lexikon zum Alten Testament*, ^{2}1958, ^{3}1967ff.
KBo	*Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazköy*
KHC	*Kurzer Handcommentar zum Alten Testament*, ed. K. Marti
KlSchr	*Kleine Schriften* (A. Alt, 1953-59; O. Eissfeldt, 1962ff.)
KUB	*Keilschriftenurkunden aus Boghazköi*
KuD	*Kerygma und Dogma*, Göttingen
Lane	E. W. Lane, *An Arabic-English Lexicon*, London, 1863-1893
Lat.	Latin
LD	*Lectio Divina*
Leslau, *Contributions*	W. Leslau, *Ethiopic and South Arabic Contributions to the Hebrew Lexicon* (1958)
Levy, *WTM*	J. Levy, *Wörterbuch über die Talmudim und Midraschim*, ^{2}1924=1963
LexSyr	C. Brockelmann, *Lexicon Syriacum*, ^{2}1968
LidzEph	M. Lidzbarski, *Ephemeris für semitische Epigraphik*, 1900-1915
LidzNE	M. Lidzbarski, *Handbuch der nordsemitischen Epigraphik*, 1898
lit.	literally
LRSt	*Leipziger Rechtswissenschaftliche Studien*
LSS	*Leipziger Semitische Studien*
LThK	*Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche*, 1930-38, ^{2}1957ff.
LUÅ	*Lunds Universitets Årsskrift*
LXX	Septuagint
MAOG	*Mitteilungen der Altorientalischen Gesellschaft*, Leipzig
MBPAR	*Münchener Beiträge zur Papyrusforschung und Antiken Rechtsgeschichte*
MDAI	*Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts in Kairo*, Wiesbaden

Material com direitos autorais

MdD	E. S. Drower-R. Macuch, *Mandaic Dictionary*, Oxford, 1963
MDOG	*Mitteilungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft*, Berlin
MeyerK	*Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament*, initiated by H. A. W. Meyer, Göttingen
MIFAO	*Mémoires publiés par les membres de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale au Caire*, Cairo
MIO	*Mitteilungen des Instituts für Orientforschung*, Berlin
MKAW	*Mededelingen der Kon. Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen*, Amsterdam
MKPAW	*Monatsberichte der Königlich-Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, Berlin
MPG	*Patrologia Graeca*, ed. J. P. Migne, Paris
MPL	*Patrologia Latina*, ed. J. P. Migne, Paris
ms.	manuscript
MT	Massoretic Text
MThS	*Münchener Theologische Studien*
MThZ	*Münchener Theologische Zeitschrift*
Mus	*Le Muséon, Revue d'Études Orientales*
MUSJ	*Mélanges de l'Université St. Joseph*, Beirut
MVÄG	*Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatisch-Ägyptischen Gesellschaft* (Berlin), Leipzig
n.d.	no date
NedGTT	*Nederduitse Gereformeerde Teologiese Tydskrif*
NedThT	*Nederlands Theologisch Tijdschrift*, Wageningen
NKZ	*Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift*, Erlangen, Leipzig
n.n.	no name
NovT	*Novum Testamentum*, Leiden
NRTh	*Nouvelle Revue Théologique*, Paris
NSI	G. A. Cooke, *A Text-Book of North-Semitic Inscriptions*, Oxford, 1903
NTS	*New Testament Studies*, Cambridge
NTT	*Norsk Teologisk Tidsskrift*, Oslo
obj.	object
OECT	*Oxford Editions of Cuneiform Texts*, London, 1923ff.
OIP	*Oriental Institute Publications*, Chicago, 1924ff.
OLP	*Orientalia Lovaniensia Periodica*
OLZ	*Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* (Leipzig), Berlin
Or	*Orientalia. Commentarii periodici Pontificii Instituti Biblici*, Rome
OrAnt	*Oriens Antiquus*
OrNeer	*Orientalia Neerlandica*, Leiden
OTL	*The Old Testament Library*
OTS	*Oudtestamentische Studiën*, Leiden
OuTWP	*De Ou Testamentiese Werkgemeenskap in Suid-Afrika*, Pretoria
PAAJR	*Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research*
par.	parallel/and parallel passages
pass.	passive
PBS	*Publications of the Babylonian Section of the University Museum*, Philadelphia
PEQ	*Palestine Exploration Quarterly*, London
perf.	perfect
Phoen.	Phoenician
PJ	*Palästinajahrbuch*, Berlin
PN	name of a person
PN	H. Ranke, *Die ägyptischen Personennamen*, 1935-1952
PNU	F. Gröndahl, *Personennamen der Texte aus Ugarit*, Rome, 1967
prep.	preposition
PRU	*Le Palais Royal d'Ugarit*, ed. Cl. Schaeffer, Paris
PSBA	*Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology*, Bloomsbury (London)

Material com direitos autorais

ptcp.	participle
Pun.	Punic
PV	*Parole di Vita*
PW	A. Pauly-G. Wissowa, *Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft,* 1894ff.
Pyr.	Pyramid Texts, ed. K. Sethe
QuaestDisp	*Quaestiones Disputatae,* ed. K. Rahner and H. Schlier, 1959ff.
R	H. C. Rawlinson, *The Cuneiform Inscriptions of Western Asia,* London, 1861-1909
RA	*Revue d'Assyriologie et d'Archéologie Orientale,* Paris
RAC	*Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum,* ed. Th. Klauser, 1941ff.
RÄR	H. Bonnet, *Reallexikon der ägyptischen Religionsgeschichte*
RB	*Revue Biblique,* Paris
RdM	*Die Religionen der Menschheit,* ed. C. M. Schröder
RE	*Real-Enzyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche,* ^{3}1896-1913
RÉg	*Revue d'Égyptologie*
repr.	reprint, reprinted
RES	*Revue des Études Sémitiques,* Paris
RES (with number)	*Répertoire d'Épigraphie Sémitique*
RevQ	*Revue de Qumrân,* Paris
RevRéf	*La Revue Réformee*
RGG	*Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart,* ^{3}1957-1965
RHA	*Revue Hittite et Asianique,* Paris
RHJE	*Revue de l'Histoire Juive en Égypte*
RHPR	*Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses,* Strasbourg, Paris
RHR	*Revue de l'Histoire des Religions,* Paris
RivBibl	*Rivista Biblica,* Rome
RLA	*Reallexikon der Assyriologie,* ed. G. Ebeling and B. Meissner, Berlin, I 1932, II 1938, III 1, 2 1957/59
RLR	*Revue de Linguistique Romane*
RLV	*Reallexikon der Vorgeschichte,* ed. Max Ebert, Berlin, 1924-1932
RoB	*Religion och Bibel. Nathan Söderblom-Sällskapets Årsbok*
RS	Ras Shamra
RScR	*Revue des Sciences Religieuses*
RSO	*Rivista degli Studi Orientali,* Rome
RSPT	*Revue des Sciences Philosophiques et Théologiques,* Paris
RT	*Recueil de Travaux relatifs à la philologie et à l'archéologie égyptiennes et assyriennes*
RTP	*Revue de Théologie et de Philosophie,* Lausanne
Ry	Enumeration in G. Ryckmans, *Inscriptions sudarabes* I-XVII; *Le Muséon,* 40-72
SAHG	A. Falkenstein-W. von Soden, *Sumerische und akkadische Hymnen und Gebete*
SAK	*Die sumerischen und akkadischen Königsinschriften,* ed. F. Thureau-Dangin (=*VAB,* I)
SAT	*Die Schriften des Alten Testaments in Auswahl,* trans. and ed. H. Gunkel, *et al.,* Göttingen
SAW	*Sitzungsberichte der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien*
SBAW	*Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften,* Munich
SBM	*Stuttgarter Biblische Monographien*
SBS	*Stuttgarter Bibel-Studien*
SBT	*Studies in Biblical Theology*
SchThU	*Schweizerische Theologische Umschau,* Bern
ScrHier	*Scripta Hierosolymitana. Publications of the Hebrew University,* Jerusalem
SDAW	*Sitzungsberichte der Deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*
SEÅ	*Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok,* Lund

Material com direitos autorais

Sem	*Semitica*
Seux	J. M. Seux, *Epithètes Royales Akkadiennes et Sumériennes,* Paris, 1968
SG	F. Delitzsch, *Sumerische Grammatik*
SgV	*Sammlung gemeinverständlicher Vorträge und Schriften aus dem Gebiet der Theologie und Religionsgeschichte,* Tübingen
SJT	*Scottish Journal of Theology,* Edinburgh
SL	A. Deimel, *Šumerisches Lexikon,* Rome, 1925-1937
SMSR	*Studi e Materiali di Storia delle Religioni* (Rome), Bologna
SNumen	*Supplements to Numen*
SNVAO	*Skrifter utgitt av Det Norske Videnskaps-Akademi i Oslo*
Soq.	Soqoṭri
SPAW	*Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*
SSAW	*Sitzungsberichte der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig*
SSN	*Studia Semitica Neerlandica*
StANT	*Studien zum Alten und Neuen Testament,* Munich
St.-B.	H. L. Strack-P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch,* 1923-1961
StOr	*Studia Orientalia,* Helsinki
StSem	*Studi Semitici*
StTh	*Studia Theologica,* Lund, Aarhus
StudGen	*Studium Generale,* Heidelberg
subj.	subject
subst.	substantive
suf.	suffix
Sum.	Sumerian
SVT	*Supplements to Vetus Testamentum,* Leiden
Synt	C. Brockelmann, *Hebräische Syntax*
Syr.	Syriac
Syr	*Syria. Revue d'Art Oriental et d'Archéologie,* Paris
TAik	*Teologinen Aikakauskirja*
TCL	*Textes Cunéiformes du Musée du Louvre*
TDNT	*Theological Dictionary of the New Testament,* ed. G. Kittel and G. Friedrich, trans. G. Bromiley
TDOT	*Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*
TGUOS	*Transactions of the Glasgow University Oriental Society*
Th.	Theologie
Theol.	Theology (of)
THAT	*Theologisches Handwörterbuch zum Alten Testament,* ed. E. Jenni and C. Westermann, Munich, 1971
ThB	*Theologische Bücherei*
Theol.Diss.	*Theologische Dissertationen,* Basel
ThLZ	*Theologische Literaturzeitung,* Leipzig, Berlin
ThR	*Theologische Rundschau,* Tübingen
ThSt	*Theologische Studien,* Zurich
ThStKr	*Theologische Studien und Kritiken,* Berlin
ThViat	*Theologia Viatorum*
ThZ	*Theologische Zeitschrift,* Basel
Tigr.	Tigrīnya (Tigriña)
trans.	translated
TrThSt	*Trierer Theologische Studien*
TrThZ	*Trierer Theologische Zeitschrift*
TS	*Theological Studies*
TüThQ	*Theologische Quartalschrift,* Tübingen, Stuttgart
TynB	*Tyndale Bulletin*
UET	*Ur Excavations. Texts,* London, 1928ff.
UF	*Ugarit-Forschungen*

Ugar.	Ugaritic
Urk.	*Urkunden des ägyptischen Altertums,* ed. G. Steindorff
UT	C. H. Gordon, *Ugaritic Textbook,* Rome, 1965
UUÅ	*Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift*
VAB	*Vorderasiatische Bibliothek*
VAS	*Vorderasiatische Schriftdenkmäler der königlichen Museen zu Berlin*
VD	*Verbum Domini,* Rome
VG	C. Brockelmann, *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen,* 1908-1913
VT	*Vetus Testamentum,* Leiden
Vulg.	Vulgate
WbÄS	A. Erman-H. Grapow, *Wörterbuch der ägyptischen Sprache,* I-V
WbMyth	*Wörterbuch der Mythologie,* ed. H. W. Haussig
Whitaker	R. E. Whitaker, *A Concordance of the Ugaritic Literature,* 1972
WMANT	*Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament,* Neukirchen
WO	*Die Welt des Orients,* Göttingen
WTM	J. Levy, *Wörterbuch über die Talmudim und Midraschim,* ^{2}1924=1963
WUS	J. Aistleitner, *Wörterbuch der ugaritischen Sprache,* ^{3}1967
WZ	*Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift*
WZKM	*Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*
ZA	*Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* (Leipzig), Berlin
ZÄS	*Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* (Leipzig), Berlin
ZAW	*Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* (Giessen), Berlin
ZDMG	*Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* (Leipzig), Wiesbaden
ZDPV	*Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins* (Leipzig, Stuttgart), Wiesbaden
ZE	*Zeitschrift für Ethnologie*
ZEE	*Zeitschrift für Evangelische Ethik,* Gütersloh
ZMR	*Zeitschrift für Missionskünde und Religionswissenschaft,* Berlin
ZNW	*Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* (Giessen), Berlin
ZRGG	*Zeitschrift für Religions- und Geistesgeschichte,* Cologne
ZS	*Zeitschrift für Semitistik und verwandte Gebiete,* Leipzig
ZST	*Zeitschrift für die Systematische Theologie* (Gütersloh), Berlin
ZThK	*Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche,* Tübingen
ZZ	*Die Zeichen der Zeit*
→	indicates cross-reference within this *Dictionary*

TRANSLITERATION OF HEBREW

CONSONANTS

Hebrew Consonant	*Technical Usage*	*Nontechnical Usage*
א	ʾ	ʾ
ב	b	b
כ	bh	bh
ג	g	g
ג	gh	gh
ד	d	d
ד	dh	dh
ה	h	h
ו	v, w	v
ז	z	z
ח	ch, ḥ	ch
ט	ṭ	t
י	y	y
כ	k	k
כ	kh	kh
ל	l	l
מ	m	m
נ	n	n
ס	s	s
ע	ʿ	ʿ
פ	p	p
פ	ph	ph
צ	ts, ṣ	ts
ק	q	q
ר	r	r
ש	ś	s
ש	sh, š	sh
ת	t	t
ת	th	th

אָב *'ābh*

Contents: I. The Word. II. "Father" in the Ancient Near East Outside the OT: 1. Egypt; 2. Mesopotamia; 3. The West Semitic Region. III. The OT: 1. Linguistic Usage; 2. The Role of the Father (Including *beth 'abh*); 3. Theological: a. "Sleeping with One's Fathers"; b. The God of the Fathers; c. The Land Promise to the Fathers; d. God's Saving Deeds to the Fathers; e. Teaching and Example of the Fathers; f. The Sins of the Fathers; g. The Fathers in the Royal Dynasty; h. Community Identification with the Fathers; i. Acknowledgment of the Sins of the Fathers; 4. God As Father: a. Proper Names; b. Yahweh As Father of the People; c. Yahweh As Father of the King; d. Isa. 9:5(6).

I. The Word. The word *'ab(u)* is found with slight variations in all Semitic languages. All attempts to trace the word back to a triliteral root must be regarded as failures. Instead it is to be understood, with Köhler,[1] as an onomatopoetic word imitating the babbling sounds of an infant, i.e., as a child's word.

'ābh. On "Father" in the OT: G. Ahlström, *Psalm 89* (Lund, 1959); B. Alfrink, "L'expression *šākab 'im 'abōtāw*," *OTS*, 2 (1943), 106-118; Alt, *GF;* B. Colless, "Dio la Patro," *Biblia Revuo*, 4/4 (1968), 5-19; F. M. Cross, "Yahweh and the God of the Patriarchs," *HThR*, 55 (1962), 225-259; L. Dürr, *Das Erziehungswesen im AT und im antiken alten Orient. MVÄG*, 36/2 (1932); J. W. Gaspar, *Social Ideas in the Wisdom Literature of the OT* (Washington, 1947); J. Hempel, *Gott und Mensch im AT. BWANT*, 3/2 (²1936); J. P. Hyatt, "Yahweh as 'the God of my Father'," *VT*, 5 (1955), 130-36; R. Knierim, *Die Hauptbegriffe für Sünde im AT* (1965); M. J. Lagrange, "La paternité de Dieu dans l'AT," *RB*, 5 (1908), 481-499; H. G. May, "The God of my Father–a Study of Patriarchal Religion," *JBR*, 9 (1941), 155-58; Noth, *IPN;* Pedersen, *ILC*, I-II, III-IV; J. G. Plöger, *Literarkritische, formgeschichtliche und stilkritische Untersuchungen zum Deuteronomium. BBB*, 26 (1967); J. R. Porter, *The Extended Family in the OT* (London, 1967); J. Scharbert, *Solidarität in Segen und Fluch im AT und in seiner Umwelt. BBB*, 14 (1958); de Vaux, *AncIsr;* J. N. M. Wijngaards, *The Dramatization of Salvific History in the Deuteronomic Schools. OTS*, 16 (1969).

On II. "Father" in the Ancient Near East Outside the OT: A. Erman-H. Ranke, *Ägypten und ägyptisches Leben im Altertum* (1923); H. Grapow, *Die bildlichen Ausdrücke des Ägyptischen* (1924); Gröndahl, *PNU;* J. Klíma, *Gesellschaft und Kultur des alten Mesopotamiens* (Prague, 1964); R. Labat, *Le caractère religieux de la royauté assyro-babylonienne* (Paris, 1939); Ranke, *PN*, I-II; J. Sainte-Fare Garnot, *L'hommage aux dieux ... d'apres les textes des pyramides* (Paris, 1954); A. van Selms, *Marriage and Family Life in Ugaritic Literature* (London, 1954); Stamm, *AN;* K. Tallqvist, *Akkadische Götterepitheta. StOr*, 7 (1938); J. Zandee, *De Hymnen aan Amon van Pap. Leiden I 350* (Leiden, 1947).

[1] *ZAW*, 55 (1937), 169ff.

Material com direitos autorais

II. "Father" in the Ancient Near East Outside the OT.

1. *Egypt.* The Egyptian word for "father" is *it.*[2] In most cases this word is used of an earthly father.[3] It is also used in the broader sense of "ancestor, forefather," often in the plural.

This word is used figuratively in expressions like "I was a father to the child," and he was "a father to orphans, a husband to widows." An official was said to be "a good father to his people." The king was referred to as "father of the two countries" or as "the good bearer of water, who keeps his army alive, father and mother to all men."[4] It is clear that these expressions contain above all comparisons based on the idea of a father providing for the needs of his children.

It is noteworthy that the Egyptian terms used for relatives are limited to the most intimate family relationships (father, mother, son, daughter, brother, sister). This indicates that only the small family unit was felt to play a crucial role in Egyptian social life. The same thing was true in the public administration, where originally the highest public offices were held by royal princes.[5]

An outstanding feature of Egyptian family life was the reverence the son showed to his father. He was responsible for his father's funeral, and for offering the sacrifice at his tomb. E.g., the provincial prince Khnumhotep boasts: "I have exalted the name of my father, and have supplied the place of the cult of the dead and the provisions which are necessary for it."[6] But also more generally, Egyptian literature often contains admonitions that a person show love, gratitude, and respect to his parents.

It was the father's duty to educate the children, as is clear in that many of the Egyptian books of wisdom claim to be a father's teaching for his son.[7] They emphasize that it is good when the son obeys his father.[8]

Since the families and genealogies of the gods have an important place in Egyptian mythology, "father" is often used as a divine epithet. Thus, Osiris above all is known as the father of Horus, e.g., in Pyr. 650b he is called "the father of Horus, who begat him";[9] and Horus is said to be "the one who acts in his father's behalf" (*nḏ it.f*).[10] Several gods are known as "father of the gods" (*it nṯr.w*), among them Atum, Re, Nun, Geb, Ptah.[11] The primal- and creator-god boasts that he was "without father and mother," or that he is "the bull of his mother" (Kamutef), i.e., he begat himself (above all, Amon and Min).[12] "Father of fathers, mother of mothers," i.e., primal-father and primal-

---

2 *WbÄS,* I, 141f.
3 It is used of animals as well as of people. *WbÄS,* I, 14/15.
4 Grapow, 132f.
5 Helck-Otto, *Kleines Wörterbuch der Aegyptologie* (1956), 96f.
6 Erman-Ranke, 184.
7 Dürr, 15.
8 *Ibid.,* 32f.
9 Sainte-Fare Garnot, 120ff.
10 *Ibid.,* 135ff.
11 Zandee, 93f.
12 *RÄR,* 364.

Copyrighted material

mother, also occur as divine epithets. Strange as it may seem, one and the same God can appear as father and mother: thus Ptah, Osiris, Amon. [13] Amon is often called "father and mother (or merely father) of mankind," which in particular emphasizes his function as creator (cf. Aton, who is described as "mother and father of everything which has been made," and the sun-god, who is called "mother of the earth, father of mankind"). [14]

From the first Intermediate Period on, there are also proper names which characterize a given individual as son of a god. Such a designation was limited to kings in the Old Kingdom. The reason for this change is that the social unrest in the first Intermediate Period brought about a democratization. In the New Kingdom names like "Amon is my father," "Chons is my father," etc., appear. According to Ranke, this indicates a deepened piety. [15]

Finally, the king is designated as "father of the child, nurse of the infant." [16] The priestly title *it nṯr,* "divine father," which refers to a priest of the highest rank, has not been explained satisfactorily. [17]

2. *Mesopotamia.* a. As M. Lambert has demonstrated, [18] the Sumerian language has at least three different expressions for "father": (i) *a,* later *a-a,* "father" = "begetter"; (ii) *ab-ba,* "father" = "head of the family"; and (iii) *ad-da,* which is found only in texts from Nippur, and to which the Elamite word for "father" is related. The difference between the first two terms is evident, e.g., in two epithets of En-lil: he is called *ab-ba dingir-dingir-e-ne,* "father of all gods," i.e., the *Pater familias* of the world of the gods; and *a-a-kalam-ma,* "father of the land," i.e., begetter and creator of the world.

b. Like the other Semitic languages, Akkadian has only one word for "father," viz., *abu(m),* which is used to convey both of these nuances. When it means "father" in the physical sense, it often appears alongside or is used as a synonym for *bānû,* "begetter." Sometimes a distinction is made between *ālidānu,* "the physical father," and "step-father" or "foster-father." [19] But *abu* is also used with reference to other men: kings speak of their predecessors on the throne as "my father" (there are also instances in which the plural means "ancestors"); a king or a protector of the people is addressed as "my father and lord" (*abī bēlī,* or some similar expression); cf. *TCL,* 14, 13:27: "Thou art my father and my lord, I have no other father but thee." The sheiks of the semi-nomadic peoples

---

[13] Zandee, 93; Kees, *Der Götterglaube im Alten Ägypten* (²1956), 162.
[14] Grapow, 133.
[15] Ranke, *PN,* II, 233f., 238; cf. 226, 243.
[16] Grapow, 133. The royal title *ity* is also related to the word *it;* cf. Kees, *Totenglauben* (²1956), 217.
[17] Was the original meaning "father of daughters," who lived in the harem of the god? *RÄR,* 256.
[18] *GLECS,* 9 (1960-1963), 52f.
[19] Driver-Miles, *Assyrian Laws* (1935), 223.

Copyrighted material

regions," and *abu ṣalmāt qaqqadi,* "father of the blackheaded ones" (i.e., men). Anu is called *abu ša ilāni bānū kalāma,* "father of the gods, creator of all," and *abu šamê ū erṣetim,* "father of the heaven and of the earth." [27] Here it is clear that the word "father" is synonymous with creator or originator, and also an expression for power and authority.

Occasionally, the relationship between god and man is characterized as a father-child relationship. Thus a certain god is said to show mercy as a father, or to forgive as a father. It has been said that "they spoke of Marduk as one would speak of a father and a mother." Such a statement refers primarily to the kindness and care of the deity. It was natural, then, for the tutelary god of some man to be addressed as *abī,* "my father." [28]

There is a particular problem connected with statements in which a king asserts that he has no other father or mother than a certain deity. [29] Scholars are divided as to whether such a statement is intended to convey the idea that the king was physically the product of a divine begettal, or merely that the deity gave the king special protection. [30]

Perhaps this question can be settled by referring to the use of *abu* in proper names. A few proper names, such as *dAnum-ki-i-a-bi-ia,* "Anu is like my father," merely suggest that the deity's behavior is similar to a father's behavior. Others, like *Šamaš-abī,* "Shamash is my father," *Sin-Abūšu,* "Sin is his father," and the like, indicate unequivocally that the god who is named is considered to be the man's father. Stamm understands these names as "expressions of prospective trust"; they are analogous to the names which refer to a man as a son of the deity or as begotten by him. [31] It is certain that there is no mythology here, but rather a man is simply described as standing under special divine protection. [32] But we cannot be sure about names in which *abī,* or the like, seems to be a substitute for a divine name, as in *Abī-nāsir,* "my father protects," *Abī-iddina,* "my father has given," etc. Noth regards *abu* as a theophorous element, [33] which is certainly true in many cases (especially with reference to the tutelary god), [34] but there are other cases in which it seems to refer to the earthly father, as Stamm has argued.

3. *The West Semitic Region.* West Semitic literature is little different from Akkadian in the way it uses the word "father." [35] Most of the examples refer to the earthly father; thus, e.g., Mesha (line 2 of the Mesha Inscription), Aḥiram (*KAI,* 1.1), Barrakib (*KAI,* 215.18), and Panammuwa (*KAI,* 214.8f.) speak of their fathers in a literal sense. In the Ugaritic texts, Keret and Danel are men-

---

27 Tallqvist, 1f.
28 Stamm, 54f.
29 Labat, 57; Engnell, *Studies in Divine Kingship* (Uppsala, 1943), 16.
30 Sjöberg, *RoB,* 20 (1961), 14-29.
31 Stamm, 208f.; cf. 222.
32 Dhorme, *La religion assyro-babylonienne* (1910), 196f.
33 *IPN,* 66ff.
34 Stamm, 54f.
35 *DISO.*

Copyrighted material

tioned as fathers. The plural is used to refer to the forefathers,[36] and the expression *byt ʾb* is used for the family or the dynasty.[37] In the Ugaritic texts, a certain "*Hrgb*, father of the eagle (vulture)"[38] is mentioned in conjunction with "*Ṣml*, the mother of the eagle."[39] It is obvious in this case that a mythological couple represent the (species) eagles. Ugaritic also has the word *ḥtk*, which (probably with different vocalizations) sometimes means "father" and sometimes "origin."[40]

There are numerous examples of the metaphorical use of *ʾb* in West Semitic literature. For example, Kilamuwa says: "I was a father to one person, and a mother to another, and a brother to yet a third."[41] And in the Karatepe Inscription we read, "Baal made me a father and a mother of the Danuna,"[42] a statement which obviously is describing the king as protector and sustainer of his people. Ahikar is called "father of all Assyria" (55). This expression means that he was the counsellor, because the land was dependent on the counsellor as a child on his father.

In the Ugaritic texts, Danel calls El his father, as when he says: "O Bull El, my father."[43] It is not absolutely clear whether this means that the king is the son of the god, because the god Baal uses the same expression,[44] and the bull El is said to be Baal's father.[45] As a divine epithet, *ʾb* is applied to El: he is called *ʾb bn ʔl*, "father of the sons of the gods" (i.e., of the pantheon),[46] *ʾb ʾdm*, "father of mankind" (i.e., of the human race),[47] and *ʾb šnm*,[48] an epithet which has not yet been explained satisfactorily. At first it was assumed that this expression meant "father of the years" (so still Driver); but now many scholars doubt this, and it is thought that *šnm* is a place name, or the son of El,[49] or El's celestial habitation.[50]

It is interesting that some Aramaic inscriptions state that some king was put on the throne because of the righteousness (or loyalty, *ṣdq*)[51] of his father.[52] The Aqhat Epic refers to certain responsibilities which a son has to his father. But these have to do with cultic assistance primarily.[53]

---

36 *KAI*, 215.16; cf. *DISO*, 5.
37 *DISO*, 3; *KAI*, 24.5; 214.9; 215.2f.
38 *CTA*, 19 [I D], 121.
39 *CTA*, 19 [I D], 135.
40 Van Selms, 94; cf. also *UF*, 1 (1969), 179, n. 4.
41 *KAI*, 24.10f.
42 *KAI*, 26 I.3.
43 *CTA*, 17 [II D], I, 24.
44 *CTA*, 2 [III AB], III, 19.
45 *CTA*, 2 [III AB], I, 16f.; 6 [I AB], VI, 27; etc.
46 *CTA*, 32, 25.
47 *CTA*, 14 [I K], I, 37, 43, etc.
48 *CTA*, 6 [I AB], I, 8; 4 [II AB], IV, 24; 17 [II D], VI, 49.
49 *UT*, Glossary.
50 *WUS*.
51 See *KAI*, 215.11.
52 *KAI*, 215.19f.; 216.4f.; cf. 215.1f., where only the father is mentioned.
53 *CTA*, 17 [II D], I, 27-34; Koch, *ZA*, N.F. 24 (1947), 214ff.; similarly already Engnell, 136f.

Copyrighted material

some ancestral father.[61] (d) *ʾabh* is applied to a man who is considered worthy of special honor, e.g., an older man (1 S. 24:12[11]), a teacher or prophetic master (2 K. 2:12; 6:21; 13:14), a priest (Jgs. 17:10; 18:19; cf. *beni*, "my son," as a word used by a wisdom teacher to address his students). (e) *ʾabh* sometimes means a protector, who to some extent takes the place of a father (Ps. 68:6 [5], "father of the fatherless," so also Sir. 4:10; Job 29:16, "a father to the poor"; Isa. 22:21, "a father to the inhabitants of Jerusalem." (f) *ʾabh* is used to designate a counsellor (Gen. 45:8; 1 Macc. 2:65; 11:32).[62] (g) *ʾabh* also can mean creator (of the rain, Job 38:28).

The reason *ʾabh* has so many different meanings in the OT is probably that the Semitic languages originally referred to a distinction between the generations, and were not concerned to denote exact relationships between people. Consequently, each representative of the older generation was called *ʾabh*, and each representative of the younger generation was called a → בֵּן *bēn*. This explains how *ʾabh* can be used as a title of honor. In most cases, however, the Hebrew linguistic use of this word corresponds with our own.

2. *The Role of the Father (Including beth ʾabh).* The social life of Israel was closer to that of the Semitic nomadic peoples than to the city culture of the ancient Near East. The dominant factors in her social structure were the tribe and the clan rather than the village, the city, and the district. As among the Bedouins, a well-rounded life was thought to be possible only within the fellowship of the tribe.[63] As a result, an individual's parentage and genealogy were considered to be of great importance. Thus the tribal father or original ancestor was very significant. In Deutero-Isaiah (51:2), "Abraham your father" is used as an example from which one may learn and take courage.

In the Israelite family, the father has almost unlimited authority. He is master of the house; the children are taught to honor and fear him (Mal. 1:6). He controls the other members of the family as a potter controls his clay (Isa. 64:7 [8]). Yet "he is not an isolated despot, but the centre from which strength and will emanate through the whole of the sphere which belongs to him and to which he belongs. When a man is called father, it really implies the same thing, kinship and authority also being expressed by the name of father. To the Israelite the name of father always spells authority. Naaman is called father by his servants (2 K. 5:13). The priest is called the father of the cultic community of which he is the head (Jgs. 18:19), and Elijah is called father by his disciples (2 K. 2:12). Round the man the house groups itself, forming a psychic community, which is

---

[61] Cf. A. Haldar, *Associations of Cult Prophets* (Uppsala, 1945), 36ff. Quell, *TDNT*, V, 961, n. 5: "patron," differs from this view. Scharbert, 61, writes: "The OT conveys a different idea here from the Phoenician mythology in Philo Byblius, where different gods are considered to be inventors of different occupations and skills."

[62] Cf. de Boer, *SVT*, 3 (1955), 57ff. According to Brunner, *ZÄS*, 86 (1961), 99, the Hebrew in Gen. 45:8 is the same as the Egyptian expression *jt nṯr* in the sense of "tutor of the crown-prince."

[63] Scharbert, 76ff.

Copyrighted material

(20:20; cf. also 28:24). But the responsibility of the father appears indirectly in Job 5:4, where the children of a foolish man have no protector. The first requirement of a father is to fear God; then he will be a refuge to his children (Prov. 14:26). There is a major emphasis in the Wisdom Literature on the importance of training children: a father must discipline his son, or else he will destroy him (19:18); he must train up a child in the way he should go (22:6); he must teach his son wisdom, if he wishes to be glad (10:1; 23:24). Several passages indicate that bodily punishment played an important role in the child's training (3:12; 4:3f.; 6:20-27; 13:1,24; 29:17f.).[70]

At the same time, it is the responsibility of the children to hearken to their father (Prov. 23:22) and in this way to make their parents glad (15:20; 23:22,25).[71]

3. *Theological.* In many expressions in which *ʾabh(oth)* occurs in the OT, there is a strong feeling of a bond between the generations.

a. *"Sleeping with One's Fathers."* Perhaps this feeling is reflected most clearly by the expression *shakhabh ʿim ʾabhothav,* "he lay down with his fathers" (Gen. 47:30; Dt. 31:16; 2 S. 7:12; and 35 times in 1-2 K. and 2 Ch.). As Alfrink has shown, this expression almost exclusively refers to kings, and only in cases in which a king died a natural death. The expression *neʾesaph ʾel ʿammav,* "he was gathered to his people," has a similar meaning, but it is found only in the Pentateuch! However, the expression *neʾesaph ʾel ʾabhothav,* "he was gathered to his fathers," appears outside the Pentateuch (cf. Jgs. 2:10; 2 K. 22:20 = 2 Ch. 34:28). According to Pedersen, all these expressions grew out of the custom of burying a person at the family grave.[72] But the fact that the burial is usually mentioned separately seems to oppose this explanation. (And yet, 1 K. 11:21 makes it clear that *shakhabh,* etc., is synonymous with *muth;* David "sleeps with his fathers" and Joab "dies.") In agreement with this, the use of these expressions does not always correspond to actual burial places.[73] But in spite of this, the original idea must have been that the deceased is united in death with his fathers or relatives who died before him (→ שְׁאוֹל *sheʾôl*). Later these formulas became stereotyped, and were not always used consistently.

b. *The God of the Fathers.* In the Exodus traditions, Yahweh is referred to several times as "the God of the fathers," e.g., in Ex. 3:15 (E): "Yahweh, the God of your fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, has sent me to you" (cf. 3:6, "I am the God of your father, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob"). Here the present form of the text emphasizes the continuity between the God who reveals himself to Moses and the God who guided the patriarchs. In the patriarchal narratives, the old

---

70 Cf. Dürr, 114f.
71 Gaspar, 102f.
72 *ILC,* II, 480f.
73 Alfrink, 118.

Copyrighted material

tradition: When the children ask their fathers, "What do these stones mean?" the fathers will tell them the story of the crossing of the Jordan. In a similar way, the fathers were to tell their children the tradition of the exodus in the Passover festival (Ex. 12:24ff.; 13:8). The Deuteronomist emphasizes the father's duty to teach God's commandments to his children (6:7; cf. also 32:7,46). Ps. 78:5f. deals with God's saving deeds in general, which are to be handed down from generation to generation; and Gen. 18:19 refers to God's charge to Abraham as a father to teach his children and his household the righteous life. [82]

In this way there is formed a continuity between the generations, in which the fathers give instruction and provide an example. It may be good or it may be bad for children to follow the example of the fathers. There are many warnings in the OT against following the bad example of the fathers (Ps. 78:8,57; Ezk. 20:18; Zec. 1:4; 2 Ch. 30:7f.; cf. Jer. 9:13[14]; 23:27; implicitly also Am. 2:4). Dt. 32:17 mentions a violation of a good tradition: they sacrificed to gods whom their fathers had never feared.

f. *The Sins of the Fathers.* A special type of connection between the generations is reflected in an ancient confession formula. As a commentary on the commandment to worship one God alone, this has been inserted after the commandment forbidding the manufacture of graven images (Ex. 20:5f. = Dt. 5:9f.). It also occurs in the narrative that tells of Moses' interview with Yahweh on Sinai (Ex. 34:7) and in an intercessory prayer of Moses (Nu. 14:18). The formula affirms that Yahweh, the jealous God, "visits the sins of the fathers on the children, the grandchildren, and the great-grandchildren." [83] In the Decalog this statement stands in contrast to the promise that Yahweh will "show steadfast love to thousands (of generations?)," if one keeps his commandments. The basic idea this statement conveys is that the steadfast love and faithfulness of God are infinitely more powerful than the inevitable consequence of sinning against his jealous holiness (→ קנאה *qin'āh*). But it also acknowledges and emphasizes the solidarity between the generations in deeds and their consequences. The retribution for sins is said to extend over a household for four generations, while God's grace is said to extend to a thousand generations. [84] In the final section of the Holiness Code, the same principle is applied to the case where the people continue in sin and must go into exile: then those who are left in the land "shall pine away ... because of their (own) iniquity; and also because of the iniquities of their fathers they shall pine away like them" (Lev. 26:39–those who are left behind in Judah when the Babylonians have carried the Jews into exile lament in a similar way: "Our fathers sinned, ... and we bear their iniquities,"

---

[82] On this see Dürr, 107f.

[83] Scharbert, 127f.; Knierim, 205.

[84] Using as the basis of his argument the ancient scheme of curse and blessing, Scharbert, 128, 180, explains this formula somewhat differently: the curse continues to be effective only into the fourth generation, while the blessing continues to be effective for an infinite period of time.

Material com direitos autorais

Lam. 5:7; cf. also Isa. 65:7). Here the sons are not without guilt. They have imitated their fathers. "Fathers and sons are regarded . . . as being of one and the same mind, and destruction will come upon both of them alike." [85] Furthermore, Lev. 26:40 contains the people's confession of their own sins along with the sins of their fathers, which was common in the postexilic period. [86]

A rigid interpretation of this same principle appears in the proverb quoted by Jeremiah (31:29) and Ezekiel (18:2): "The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge." In both passages this proverb is rejected as false. The passage in Jeremiah looks forward to a new age, in which the old laws will no longer be valid. In Ezekiel this proverb is connected with the question of individual responsibility: it is not useless to return to God, for punishment is not finally determined by the sins of the fathers. Jer. 32:18f. contains a kind of dilemma between the concept of individual responsibility and the idea of a collective continuity from one generation to the next; actually, this dilemma is never reconciled in the OT: on one side stands the solidarity of the generations, and on the other the responsibility of the individual (when Dt. 24:16 states that the children shall not be put to death because of the sin of the fathers [this verse is quoted verbatim in 2 K. 14:6], it is dealing with civil penal law, not with divine retribution).

g. *The Fathers in the Royal Dynasty*. The writers of the Deuteronomic history also repeatedly state this dilemma in the relationship between the fathers and their descendants. In the narrative dealing with the Davidic dynasty, on the one hand, God remains faithful to his promise to David, so that a descendant of David will always sit on the throne; even when David's descendant was ungodly, Yahweh "gave him a lamp in Jerusalem . . ., because David did what was right in the eyes of the Lord" (1 K. 15:4f.). [87] On the other hand, the writers of the Deuteronomic history evaluate each individual king on the basis of his own religious attitude and behavior. If a king behaves "like his father (David)," his reign is considered to be a time of blessing (1 K. 15:11; 22:43; 2 K. 14:3; 15:3,34; 18:1-7; 22:2; 23:25). If, however, a king does that which is displeasing to Yahweh "like his father," "like his fathers," or the like (statements such as this must refer to wicked fathers), he is censured, and his reign is regarded as a time of disaster (1 K. 15:3; 2 K. 21:19ff.; 24:19; or 23:32,37). "By their religious behavior, the individual kings were thought to exhibit a certain solidarity either with David and the fathers who were loyal to the Yahweh covenant, or with the fathers who broke the covenant." [88]

h. *Community Identification with the Fathers*. The promises to the patriarchs are never mentioned in the preexilic prophets. And yet, from time to time they

---

85 Scharbert, 202.
86 See below, i.
87 Scharbert, 197.
88 *Ibid*.

Material com direitos autorais

mention a different kind of community identification with the fathers. The fathers sinned; even the patriarch Jacob was a deceiver (Hos. 12:4[3]), and the Israelites living today are like their fathers (9:10; Am. 2:4). The generations are alike in their apostasy: "a man and his father go in to the same maiden" (Am. 2:7). "The divine judgments come, not because of the sins of the fathers, but because the present generation has sinned like the fathers. Between fathers and sons stands a solidarity of attitude which is rebellion against God." [89]

Jeremiah also knows of this relationship of apostasy. The fathers have already forsaken Yahweh: "What wrong did your fathers find in me that they went far from me?" (Jer. 2:5). But the sons, i.e., the present generation, act the same way. They are stiffnecked, worse than their fathers (7:26); they go after the Baals like their fathers (9:12f.[13f.]; 23:27), they have turned back to the iniquities of their forefathers (11:10), and they sacrifice to the queen of heaven like their fathers (44:17). The example of the fathers is at work in the religious activities of the present generation and brings upon it a punishment that will destroy fathers and sons together (6:21; 13:14; 16:3f.; cf. 6:11,13).[90] Allusions to the promises to the fathers and the covenant which Yahweh made with them serve only to emphasize the apostasy (7:22; 11:3,7). In fact, according to 31:32, the covenant with the fathers will be transcended by a new covenant in which the inner renewal of the man guarantees covenant loyalty. It is in this context that the promise of the people's return to the land which was given to the fathers (30:3) belongs. Also, the promise that the people will remain in the land of their fathers (25:5) is given on the condition that they turn from their evil way. On the other hand, 3:18 and 16:15 (which contain the promise that the exiles will return to the land of Palestine) are probably later additions.

Ezekiel also declares this identification in apostasy, e.g., 2:3: "they and their fathers have transgressed against me"; 20:24: "their eyes were set on their fathers' idols"; cf. 16:44: "like mother, like daughter." All generations will suffer punishment (9:6); fathers and children will even eat one another (5:10). But at the same time, Ezekiel knows of a future restoration, in which the people shall dwell in the land where their fathers (the patriarchs) dwelled, with their children and their children's children (37:25). The return to the land which Yahweh gave to the fathers implies both the renewal of the covenant (36:28–note the covenant formula!) and the recognition of the power and nature of Yahweh (20:42). The land promised to the fathers will again become the inheritance of Israel (47:14). This restoration also means a return to the old relationship between Yahweh and the fathers.

Deutero-Isaiah knows the prophetic tradition that the fathers have sinned (Isa. 43:27; cf. 48:8). But at the same time he stands in the tradition of the poetry of the Psalms which reflects a positive attitude toward the fathers: "Look to Abraham our father" (51:2). In the other postexilic prophets, emphasis is placed on the idea that there is a solidarity between fathers and sons in sin (Zec.

---

89 *Ibid.*, 211.
90 Cf. *ibid.*, 214ff.

Material com direitos autorais

1:2f.; 8:14f.; Mal. 3:6f.): Therefore Yahweh will requite "your iniquities and your fathers' iniquities together" (Isa. 65:6f.).

i. *Acknowledgment of the Sins of the Fathers.* The feeling of solidarity between the generations in sin is also expressed positively in the confession of sins: "Both we and our fathers have sinned" (Ps. 106:6; so similarly Jer. 3:25; 14:20). 2 K. 22:13 affords a concrete example: "Great is the wrath of the Lord that is kindled against us, because our fathers have not obeyed the words of this book"– however, this verse does not speak of "our" sins. Lev. 26:40 (H; postexilic redaction?) predicts that the dispersed Israelites will confess their own sins and the sins of their fathers. We find this type of confession as a liturgical formula in the prayer of repentance of the postexilic community (Ezr. 9:6f.; Neh. 1:6; Dnl. 9:16; Tob. 3:3; cf. Bar. 1:16f.; 3:4ff.).[91] It is difficult to determine the extent to which this formula had already been formed in the preexilic period, because the date of most of the relevant passages is uncertain. Jer. 3:25 may be a liturgical expansion, but Jer. 14:20 shows that "the confession of the *ʿavon* of the fathers along with one's own was already practiced in the preexilic Jerusalemite cult."[92] It is worthy of note that the first certain evidence for this is to be found in Jeremiah, the great "individualist."

4. *God As Father.*

a. *Proper Names.* *ʾabh* appears as part of many proper names in the OT. In most such names the *ʾabh* serves as a theophorous element: *ʾabhiʾasaph*, "(my) father has gathered," *ʾabhighayil*, "(my) father has rejoiced (?)," *ʾabhidhan*, "my father has judged," *ʾabhidhaʿ*, "the father has taken knowledge (of me)," *ʾabhihudh*, "(my) father is majesty" (or "may he be praised"), *ʾabhihayil*, "(my) father is fear," *ʾabhichayil*, "(my) father is might," *ʾabhitubh*, "my father is goodness," *ʾabhital*, "my father is dew," *ʾabhinadhabh*, "my father has shown himself to be generous," *ʾabh(i)ner*, "my father is a lamp," *ʾabhinoʿam*, "my father is grace" (or a Tammuz epithet?), *ʾabhisaph*, "father has added," *ʾabhiʿezer*, "my father is help," *ʾabhiram*, "(my) father is exalted" (→ אברהם *ʾabhrāhām*), *ʾabhishagh* (meaning uncertain), *ʾabhishuaʿ*, "father is help," *ʾabhishur*, "(my) father is a (protecting) wall," *ʾebhyathar*, "father is/gives abundant(ly)." To some extent, all the names may be traced back to old names which reflect the idea that the tribal deity was the ancestor of the members of the tribe, but the extent to which this concept was still alive in biblical Israel is uncertain. It is possible that in some cases certain gods are called "father," as perhaps *ʾabhiʾel*, "(my) father is El" (1 S. 9:1; 14:51; Saul's grandfather); but cf. *ʾeliʾabh*, "my God is father"; and also *ʾabhimelekh*, "my father is Milk" (= Molech or Melekh) (or "king"), *ʾabhshalom*, which means either "the father is (the god) Shalom" or "the father is peace." *ʾabhital* and *ʾabhinoʿam* might also be included

---

91 *Ibid.*, 202, 247.
92 Knierim, 208.

Material com direitos autorais

in this group, if Tal is a god of the dew and if Noʿam, "the delightful one," is an epithet for Baal or Tammuz. Finally, in the names *yoʾabh* and *ʾabhiyyahu,* Yahweh is designated as father, probably in the sense of "protector." We cannot be sure about the significance of *ʾabhiyyam,* which, indeed, has been interpreted as *ʾabhiyya(hu)* (1 K. 14:31; 15:1-7), but probably should be understood differently ("my father is truly [*mi*] x"?).[93]

b. *Yahweh As Father of the People.* Other than in proper names, Yahweh is called father very rarely in the OT.[94] Occasionally he is compared with a father: as a father, he pities his children (Ps. 103:13); he reproves the man whom he loves as a father reproves the son in whom he delights (Prov. 3:12). These passages are particularly interesting because they show what characteristics of the father were considered to be the most important. The same thing is true *mutatis mutandis* of Nu. 11:12, where Moses asks reproachfully whether he had conceived and brought forth the people, and thereby intimates indirectly that Yahweh is the mother (!) of the people. The real point of this figure is that Yahweh cares for the people and is responsible for their existence.

Yahweh is also designated the father of the people of Israel. Already in Ex. 4:22(J) Yahweh calls Israel his firstborn son and demands his release from Egypt that he might serve him. Here, Yahweh makes his claim on the Israelites and confirms that he is acting in their behalf. Two more examples of this occur in the Song of Moses, Dt. 32. In v. 6, we read: "Is not he your father, who created (→ קנה *qānāh*) you, who made you and established you?" The reference to Yahweh as the creator and founder of his people establishes his claim to their gratitude. "To make" and "to establish" are part of the regular creation terminology. The meaning of *qanah* is disputed, and in any case can be used of creation (Prov. 8:22) as well as of child-bearing (Gen. 4:1). It cannot refer to physical begetting in Dt. 32:6. This is more probable in v. 18, which speaks of "the Rock that begot (*yaladh*) you" and of "the God who gave you birth (*cholel*)." But again, this verse is probably not speaking of a mythological begetting by a rock deity, because elsewhere in this song *tsur* is used figuratively in the sense of refuge (vv. 15,37), as it is ordinarily. Just as little can Jer. 2:27 be used to support the hypothesis of a myth of a birth from the rock, for this passage rebukes those "who say to a tree, 'You are my father,' and to a stone, 'You gave me birth.'" Both → עץ *ʿēts* and → אבן *ʾebhen* are a part of the regular terminology used in polemics against idols. Thus, Jer. 2:27 simply means that those whom the prophet rebukes turn to idols as creators and protectors.

Hosea uses the figure of the father in speaking of God in 11:1f., although the word *ʾabh* does not actually occur here: Yahweh called Israel out of Egypt as his son, trained him as a good father, and showered him with his care. Similarly, in Isa. 1:2 Yahweh says that he brought up children who have rebelled against him. Both of these passages refer to the disappointment of Yahweh's hope that his children would love him in return. The same thought is found in Jer. 3:19: "I

---

93 So *KBL*³.

94 Lagrange; Hempel, 131ff.; Colless.

Copyrighted material

thought you would call me, My father, and would not turn from following me"; a child is loyal to his father, but Israel has forsaken his God. Another passage in Jeremiah (31:9) emphasizes the paternal love and care of Yahweh: he will protect those who are returning home, "for I am a father to Israel, and Ephraim is my firstborn." This language has some affinities with that in Ex. 4:22.

The other relevant passages emphasize in particular the authority of the divine father. Isa. 45:9-11 is especially characteristic. Here a father is compared with a potter: as a father does not have to give an account for his actions to his children and as a potter has the clay completely at his disposal, so Yahweh, the creator, has his people at his disposal and deals with them according to his will, and they have no right to question him. The same idea is expressed in Isa. 64:7(8): "Thou art our Father; we are the clay, and thou art our potter; we are all the work of thy hand"–here in a prayer for paternal compassion. The power of the heavenly father to help and to redeem is emphasized in Isa. 63:16: Israel feels himself separated from his earthly fathers; now Yahweh is the only father who can help; he is "the Redeemer (→ גאל *gō'ēl*) from of old." Finally, once Malachi speaks of God as father and creator: "Have we not all one father? Has not *one* God created (→ ברא *bārā'*) us? Why then are we faithless to one another, profaning the covenant of our fathers?" (Mal. 2:10); the fact that Israel is a son carries with it the idea of accepting his responsibility as a son. In another passage, Malachi emphasizes the authority of Yahweh which Israel had despised: a person honors and fears his father, but Israel does not honor and fear his divine father (1:6).

It follows from all this that the idea of God as father of the people of his own possession does not occupy a central place in the faith of Israel. This is only one of many figures which the OT uses to describe the relationship between Yahweh and Israel. These figures seem to have been created generally *ad hoc;* mythological roots are hardly to be ascertained.

c. *Yahweh As Father of the King.* The idea of the king as son of God is a more firmly established characteristic of OT thought than that of Israel as Yahweh's son, and yet it is not found very often. The classic example of this concept occurs in Ps. 2:7: "You are my son, today I have begotten you," which clearly is a type of adoption formula. This statement is complemented in the Nathan prophecy, where we read: "I will be his father, and he shall be my son" (2 S. 7:14; cf. 1 Ch. 28:6). In a little greater detail, Ps. 89:27f.(26f.) says that the king will call Yahweh "Father, God, and Rock of his salvation," and Yahweh will make him the firstborn and the highest of the kings of the earth.

The real significance of these statements is disputed. The idea that they refer to a physical begetting hardly seems probable; it is more likely that they think of the king's relationship to Yahweh in terms of adoption. [95] Ps. 2:7 can be understood as an adoption formula. It is worthy of note that the poets in Pss. 2 and 89 both call on God as father in a situation in which the authority of the king is being threatened. Thus, the sonship of the king is considered to be a divine

---

[95] Ahlström, 111f.; Kraus, *BK*, XV, 19.

Copyrighted material

guarantee of his power and authority. It is divine power that gives the king his power.

d. *Isa. 9:5(6).* Among the titles of the king whose coming is announced in Isa. 9 (in v. 5[6] he is called "son") is found the epithet *ʾabhi ʿadh*. The meaning of this expression is obscure. *ʿadh* can mean "booty"; and if *ʾabhi ʿadh* could be interpreted as "father of booty" in the sense of "one who takes booty," this would fit the context of the whole passage very well. But this translation is doubtful, since there are no other examples in which *ʾabh* is used in this way. If we take *ʿadh* in the sense of "eternity," this expression may be understood as a royal epithet meaning "father of eternity," i.e., father (protector, etc.) for all the future, which would agree well with *pele' yoets*, and in and of itself is not incompatible with the other royal titles that occur here. [96]

Ringgren

---

[96] Cf. O. Kaiser, *Isaiah 1-12. OTL* (trans. 1972), 129; on the connection of the idea "eternal" with the king, see Ps. 21:5,7(4,6).

אָבַד *ʾābhadh; אֲבֵדָה ʾᵃbhēdhāh; אַבְדָן ʾabhᵉdhān; אֲבַדּוֹן ʾᵃbhaddôn*

Contents: I. Etymology, Occurrences. II. "Wander Off." III. 1. The Hiphil and the Piel with a Divine Subject; 2. The Qal of Divinely Willed Destruction. IV. 1. The Hiphil and the Piel in General Usage; 2. The Qal in General Usage. V. *ʾabhaddon* = The Underworld.

I. Etymology, Occurrences. In the Northwest Semitic languages, the primary meaning of *ʾabhadh* is "to perish."[1] Occasionally, the meaning "wander off, run away" also appears, especially with reference to animals, e.g., in 1 S. 9:3,20; the Sabbath Ostracon, line 3;[2] in Ugaritic perhaps of men,[3] and in the obscure Canaanite gloss in Papyrus Anastasi I, 23.[4] In the other Semitic languages this meaning is more widespread (Arabic, Ethiopic, etc.).

ʾābhadh. M. A. Beek, "Das Problem des aramäischen Stammvaters (Deut. XXVI 5)," *OTS*, 8 (1951), 193-212; E. Jenni, "Faktitiv und Kausativ von אבר 'zugrunde gehen'," *Hebräische Wortforschung. Festschrift für W. Baumgartner. SVT*, 16 (1967), 143-157; J. Lewy, "Grammatical and Lexicographical Studies," *Or*, N.S. 29 (1960), 20-45, esp. 22-27; A. Oepke, "ἀπόλλυμι," etc., *TDNT*, I, 394-97; D. Yellin, "Some Fresh Meanings of Hebrew Roots," *JPOS*, 1 (1920). 10f.

[1] See *DISO*, the lexicons in Hebrew, Aramaic, Syriac, Ugaritic, etc.; cf. also Jenni, 151.
[2] A. Dupont-Sommer, *Sem*, 2 (1949), 31.
[3] *CTA*, 2 [III AB], IV, 3.
[4] But see *ANET*, 477.

Copyrighted material

Israel destroys its enemies (Dt. 7:24; 9:3; Nu. 24:19; Est. 9:6,12), or when the heathen, as Yahweh's instrument, destroy Israel (Josh. 7:7; 2 K. 13:7; 24:2; Dt. 28:51; Lam. 2:9; etc.), Yahweh is behind it.

2. *The Qal of Divinely Willed Destruction.* The intransitive form of the verb *'abhadh* (qal) complements what has just been said about the piel and the hiphil. Although it is not specifically stated, in many cases it is quite clear that Yahweh is the author of the described destruction, as that of Egypt (Ex.10:7), the Canaanites (Dt. 7:20), the Philistines (Am. 1:8; Zec. 9:5), Moab (Nu. 21:29f.; Jer. 48:8, 46), Tyre (Ezk. 26:17), or all of Israel's enemies (Jgs. 5:31; Ps. 2:12; 9:4[3]; 10:16; 80:17[16]; 83:18[17]; Isa. 41:11; 60:12). They all will come under divine judgment and perish; the same thing will also happen to Israel because of her disobedience to the law (Lev. 26:38; Dt. 28:20,22; Jer. 9:11[12]) and her idolatry (Dt. 4:26; 8:19f.; 11:17; 30:18; Josh. 23:13,16). In most of these passages there recurs the typical expression *va'abhadhtem me'al ha'arets,* or the like, "and you shall perish from the land. . . ." Thus, in these texts, which deal with the acquisition of the land, the divine punishment consists in God's driving his people out of the land. Other passages state even more directly that the people shall perish in exile (Jer. 27:10,15; Ob. 12; cf. Isa. 27:13).

In Wisdom Literature and in the Psalms which are related to it, we encounter reminiscences of the sacral-legal use of *'abhadh* in the qal: anyone in the community who acts wickedly shall perish (Ps. 1:6; 37:20; 73:27; Job 4:9; 18:17; 20:7; Prov. 11:10; 28:28 [in these passages, the predominant subject is → רשׁע *rāshā'*, "the wicked, the criminal"]; cf. also the references in 4QpPs37 3:4,8). The same is true of the liar (Prov. 19:9; 21:28). More concretely, the biblical text states that the house of Ahab and those who took part in Korah's revolt will perish (2 K. 9:8; Nu. 16:33; cf. Est. 4:14).

IV. 1. *The Hiphil and the Piel in General Usage.* The passages dealt with above refer more or less clearly to divinely willed destruction. In addition, *'abhadh* is used in a more general way for destruction of enemies in political and religious conflicts (2 K. 10:19; 11:1; 19:18; Jer. 46:8; cf. also Jer. 40:15 and the Mesha Stela, *KAI,* 181.7), for ill-treatment of the people by kings and princes (Jer. 23:1; Ezk. 22:27), and for removal of idols (Nu. 33:52; Dt. 12:2f.; 2 K. 21:3–all in the piel; cf. the qal in Jer. 10:15, and the Aramaic peal in Jer. 10:11). In Wisdom Literature this word often designates the destruction done by fools, by the wicked, or by human vice (always in the piel: Prov. 1:32; 29:3; Eccl. 7:7; 9:18; cf. Ps. 119:95; Eccl. 3:6[?] and 1QS 7:6).[16]

2. *The Qal in General Usage.* Finally *'abhadh* in the qal exhibits a variety of nuances: A dozen passages refer to things and persons who vanish or perish (weapons: 2 S. 1:27; property: Dt. 22:3; cf. CD 9:10; caravans: Job 6:18; etc.). Of greater theological interest is the use of this word in prophetic texts where

---

[16] See Jenni, 152.

Material chroniony prawem autorskim

the verb describes how in critical times, when evil increases, good attributes and positive ideas vanish (truth: Jer. 7:28; knowledge of the law: Jer. 18:18; Ezk. 7:26; wisdom and good counsel: Isa. 29:14; Jer. 18:18; 49:7; Ezk. 7:26; cf. Ps. 146:4; Dt. 32:28 and CD A 5:17; righteousness: Mic. 7:2; courage: Jer. 4:9; etc.). The two plainly stereotyped expressions "the place of refuge (*manos*) is lost," i.e., there is no place of escape (Am. 2:14; Jer. 25:35; cf. Ps. 142:5[4]; Job 11:20), and "hope (→ תקוה *tiqvāh*) is lost" (Ezk. 19:5; 37:11; cf. Ps. 9:19[18]; Job 8:13; Sir. 41:2; 11QPs[a] 22:8; etc.) should also be included here. Quite understandably, idiomatic meanings of *'abhadh* developed: thus the participle *'obhedh* often means "poor" (Job 29:13; 31:19; Prov. 31:6; cf. Sir. 11:12). But quite often the qal form means simply "to die" (e.g., Nu. 17:27[12]; Isa. 57:1; Ps. 41:6[5]; 49:11 [10]; Job 4:7,11,20; Eccl. 7:15; Jonah 1:6,14; cf. the Murabba'āt Letter 45.7 and 11QPs[a] 22:9). This meaning, however, is also present in many of the passages mentioned earlier.[17]

V. 'abhaddon = The Underworld. With this nuance of *'abhadh* we come to the most important noun from this root, *'abhaddon* (with its by-form *'abhaddoh*). Very rarely does this word mean "destruction" (Job 31:12;[18] perhaps also in 1QM fragm. 9:3). Much more often in the OT, and particularly in Wisdom Literature, it means the "place of destruction," i.e., the Underworld (in three passages it is parallel with → שאול *she'ôl:* Job 26:6; Prov. 15:11; 27:20; once with → קבר *qebher:* Ps. 88:12[11]; and once with → מות *māveth:* Job 28:22). In Job 28:22, *'abhaddon* speaks as a personification of death (cf. Rev. 9:11).[19] This term also plays an important role in late Jewish apocalyptic texts (1QH 3:16,19,32 and the Aramaic 1QGenAp 12:17).[20]

Otzen

---

17 See J. L. Palache, *Sinai en Paran* (1959), 108, and cf. the piel forms in Ps. 9:6(5); 21:11 [10]; Est. 3:9,13; 4:7; 7:4; 8:5; 9:24, and the Aramaic haphel form in Dnl. 2:12,18,24, which mean simply "to put to death," Jenni, 150f., 155. A similar meaning is found in Aramaic inscriptions; see *KAI,* 223 B.7; 225.11; 226.10; cf. Jenni, 151.

18 But see Yellin, 11.

19 Cf. *TDNT,* I, 4.

20 Cf. P. Wernberg-Møller, *Textus,* 4 (1964), 153f. On the use of this term in Rabbinic literature, see Volz, *Die Eschatologie der jüdischen Gemeinde* (1934), 328f.; Ginzberg, *Legends of the Jews,* I (1909), 10, 15; St.-B., III, 810.

Material chroniony prawem autorskim

1:19; Job 39:9; Sir. 6:33. Since this verb has the negative meaning "to be unwilling" in Arabic and Ethiopic,[5] Nöldeke (66) considered this meaning to be original. If that were so, the negative in Hebrew might be interpreted as a strengthening of the negative sense. This hypothesis has rightly been rejected by Honeyman and Brockelmann.[6] It is easy to explain how the original meaning suggested above, "to show intention in a certain direction," was used in different languages predominantly for a positive or negative reaction.

II. Usages in the OT.

1. *General Observations.* In most cases, *'abhah* is followed by an infinitive, e.g., "he showed himself (did not show himself) willing to do this or that," as in Gen. 24:8, "but if the woman is not willing to follow you"; Jgs. 19:10, "but the man would not spend the night"; Job 39:9, "is the wild ox willing to serve you?" The verb whose infinitive occurs most often after *'abhah* is → שׁמע *shāma'*, "to be unwilling to hear."[7]

Since *'abhah* is not an auxiliary verb in Hebrew, it is not appropriate to add, after the pattern of modern languages, an infinitive in cases where *'abhah* is used absolutely. In 1 S. 31:4, the armor-bearer does not want to kill king Saul. This is to be understood to mean that, because of fear and respect, the armor-bearer is not able to react positively to the king's command (cf. also 1 K. 22:50; Prov. 1:10).

The person or thing that does not receive a positive response is introduced in Hebrew by *le* (Dt. 13:9[8]; Prov. 1:30).

The terms → מאן *mā'ēn*, "to refuse" (Dt. 25:7), *para'*, "to ignore" (Prov. 1:25), and → נאץ *nā'ats*, "to despise" (1:30), occur in parallelism with *lo' 'abhah*.

2. *With shāma'.* *'abhah* often occurs with *shama'*. Several times the construction is *lo' 'abhah (li)shemoa'*, "he was not willing to hear." *'abhah* is not to be regarded merely as an auxiliary verb here, as is shown by the cases in which *'abhah* appears in parallelism with *shama'*, e.g., Jgs. 11:17: "The king of Edom would not listen *(shama')*, . . . also the king of Moab would not consent *('abhah)*." The meaning of *'abhah* and *shama'* is not identical. The difference seems to be that *'abhah* denotes the first beginnings of a positive reaction, whereas *shama'* indicates complete obedience. Thus the sequence of these two verbs expresses an intensification: Dt. 13:9(8): "You shall not yield *('abhah)* to him or listen *(shama')* to him, nor shall your eye pity him. . . ." In 1 K. 20:8 we find the expression, "Do not heed *(shama')* or consent *('abhah)*" (cf. also Isa. 1:19; Ps. 81:12[11]).

In synonymous parallelism with the whole expression *(lo') 'abhah lishmoa'* we find the negative phrases *'im telekhu 'immi qeri*, "if you walk contrary to

---

5 However, there are exceptions in Arabic, Brockelmann, *Synt.*, § 52b.
6 See also § 165c.
7 See below, II.2.

Copyrighted material

me" (Lev. 26:21), and *'im tema'anu umerithem,* "if you refuse and rebel" (Isa. 1:20), and the positive expression *'im tatteh 'oznekha,* "if you incline your ear" (Sir. 6:33).

III. Specific Theological Considerations.

1. *God As Subject.* God appears as the subject of *'abhah* in specifically Deuteronomic material: "the Lord was unwilling to destroy you" (Dt. 10:10; 2 K. 8:19; 13:23); "the Lord would not hearken to Balaam" (Dt. 23:6[5]; Josh. 24:10); "the Lord would not pardon" (Dt. 29:19[20]; 2 K. 24:4). Here also *'abhah* and *shama'* appear together and refer to the covenant relationship.[8] God's act is to be understood in light of the covenant. In the framework of the covenant, a "positive reaction" is demanded of the people.

2. *Hardness of Heart.* As lord of the covenant, God also controls the activities of the enemies of his people. God hardened Pharaoh's heart so that he would not let the people go (Ex. 10:27). He also hardened Sihon's heart (Dt. 2:30). But the covenant people themselves are often the ones who rebel. In this case, the *lo' 'abhah,* "unwillingness," of the people is a technical term for hardness of heart, and appears in parallelism with → מרה *mārāh* (Dt. 1:26; Isa. 30:9; Ezk. 20:8) and other typical expressions for hardness of heart (Lev. 26:21; Isa. 1:19f.; 30:9; Ezk. 3:7; cf. also the context of Isa. 28:12). The refusal of the people is summed up in the words: "but you would not" (Dt. 1:26; Isa. 30:15; cf. Mt. 23:37).

3. *'abhah As an Attitude Toward God. 'abhah* is used to describe the positive reaction to God, the answer which man gives to his lord. Just as *shama'* means both "to hear" and "to obey," so *'abhah* means not only "to have an intention" but also "to show this intention." These two aspects cannot be separated from each other. Thus, *'abhah* stands alongside other expressions for faith, trust, and confidence as an expression for a personal commitment to God, which is the right attitude for man in covenant relationship with God. *'abhah* often occurs in a situation in which man is called on to make a choice, as in Isa. 30:15. Yahweh, the Holy One of Israel, offers salvation and deliverance: "In returning and rest you shall be saved; in quietness and in trust shall be your strength." But the people refuse *(lo' 'abhithem)* and trust in the power of horses rather than in God (30:16). In 1:19, the people are urged to show a positive intention toward God. The other possibility is expressed by characteristic terms for hardness of heart, *ma'en,* "to refuse," and *marah,* "to rebel" (1:20).

In the passages in the Wisdom Literature, *'abhah* is not directed specifically to God, but to Wisdom, its reproof (Prov. 1:25), its counsel (1:30), or quite generally in admonitions, to the son (Sir. 6:33).

B. Johnson

---

[8] Wildberger, *BK,* X, on Isa. 1:19.

Copyrighted material

אֶבְיוֹן *'ebhyôn*

Contents: I. 1. Etymology; 2. Occurrences; 3. Semantic Field of "Poor" in the OT; 4. Relationships of the Words for "Poor"; 5. The LXX. II. Need for Material and Legal Assistance: 1. Sociological Change of the *'ebhyon* in the Sabbatical Year, the Year of Release, and the Year of Jubilee; 2. Prohibition Against Defeating the Ends of the Law in the Book of the Covenant; 3. Slavery As a Payment for Debts, and the Oppression of the *'ebhyon* and the *tsaddiq* in Amos; 4. *'ebhyon* As a Tribal Brother in Deuteronomy; 5. *din 'ani ve'ebhyon* As "Knowledge of God" in Jeremiah; 6. Oppression of the *'ebhyon* As *'aven* and *to'ebhah* in Ezekiel; 7. The King As Advocate of the *'ebhyon*. III. The *'ebhyon* in the Wise Order of Creation. IV. The *'ebhyon* in Expectation of Divine Help: 1. The Enemies of the *'ebhyon;* 2. Affliction, Illness, Loneliness, Nearness to Death; 3. Religious Classification of the *'ebhyon;* 4. Yahweh, Deliverer of the *'ebhyonim;* 5. *'ebhyon* in Late Prophetic Proclamations of Salvation. V. Qumran.

I. 1. *Etymology*. Now, as before, the etymology of *'ebhyon* is uncertain. Some scholars think it was derived from a Semitic root, while others argue that it was borrowed from Egyptian. (a) Usually, *'ebhyon* is thought to be derived from a

---

'ebhyôn. S. W. Baron, *Histoire d'Israël,* I (Paris, 1956); C. Barth, *Die Errettung vom Tode in den individuellen Klage- und Dankliedern des AT* (Zollikon, 1947); W. Baudissin, "Die alttestamentliche Religion und die Armen," *Preussische Jahrbücher* (1912), 209-224; J. Begrich, "Die Vertrauensäusserungen im israelitischen Klagelied des Einzelnen und in seinem babylonischen Gegenstück," *ZAW,* 46 (1928), 221-260=*ThB,* 21 (1964), 168-216; P. van den Berghe, "'Ani et 'Anaw dans les Psaumes," *Le Psautier,* ed. R. de Langhe (Louvain, 1962), 273-295; W. Beyerlin, *Die Rettung der Bedrängten in den Feindpsalmen der Einzelnen auf institutionelle Zusammenhänge untersucht. FRLANT,* 99 (1970); H. Birkeland, *'Anī und 'ānāw in den Psalmen. SNVAO 1932,* 4 (1933); *idem, Die Feinde des Individuums in der israelitischen Psalmenliteratur* (Oslo, 1933); *idem, The Evildoers in the Book of Psalms. ANVAO 1955,* 2; H. Bruppacher, *Die Beurteilung der Armut im AT* (1924); F. Buhl, *Die socialen Verhältnisse der Israeliten* (1899); A. Causse, *Du groupe ethnique à la communauté religieuse* (Paris, 1937); *idem, Les 'pauvres' d'Israël* (Paris-Strasbourg, 1922); L. Delekat, *Asylie und Schutzorakel am Zionheiligtum. Eine Untersuchung zu den privaten Feindpsalmen* (Leiden, 1967); *idem,* "Zum hebräischen Wörterbuch," *VT,* 14 (1964), 7-66, esp. 35-49; J. Didiot, *Le pauvre dans la Bible* (Paris, 1903); F. C. Fensham, "Widow, Orphan and the Poor in Ancient Near Eastern Legal and Wisdom Literature," *JNES,* 21 (1962), 129-139; A. Gamper, *Gott als Richter in Mesopotamien und im AT. Zum Verständnis einer Gebetsbitte* (Innsbruck, 1966); R. A. Gauthier, *Magnanimité: L'idéal de l'humilité dans la philosophie païenne et dans la théologie chrétienne* (Paris, 1951), 375-404; A. Gelin, *The Poor of Yahweh* (trans. 1964); B. Gemser, "The RÎB- or Controversy-Pattern in Hebrew Mentality," *SVT,* 3 (1960), 120-137; A. George, "Pauvre," *DBS,* 7 (1966), 387-406; H. Graetz, *Kritischer Komm. zu den Psalmen,* I (1882), II (1883); H. Gunkel-J. Begrich, *Einl. in die Psalmen* (1933); E. Hammershaimb, "On the Ethics of the OT Prophets," *SVT,* 7 (1960), 75-101; F. Hauck, "πένης, πενιχρός," *TDNT,* VI (1968), 37-40; F. Hauck-E. Bammel, "πτωχός," *TDNT,* VI (1968), 885-915; C. Hauret, "Les ennemis-sorciers dans les supplications individuelles," *Rech. Bibliques,* 8 (Bruges-Paris, 1967), 129-138; P. Humbert, "Le mot biblique *'ebyôn,*" *RHPR,* 32 (1952), 1-6; A. S. Kapelrud, "New Ideas in Amos," *SVT,* 15 (1966), 193-206; O. Keel, *Feinde und Gottesleugner. Studien zum Image der Widersacher in den Individualpsalmen. SBM,* 7 (1969); R. Kittel, *Die Psalmen,* Exkurs 8: "Die Armen und Elenden" (⁶1929), 284-88; H.-J.

(continued on p. 28)

Copyrighted material

root → אבה *'ābhāh* with a common original meaning "to lack, to be in need." Heb. *'abhah,* "to comply with, to be willing," [1] is opposite to Arab. *'abā,* Ethiop. and Tigr. *'abaya,* "to be unwilling, to refuse," [2] and the Old South Arab. *t'by,* "refusal." [3] The absence of Akkadian examples is striking. Thus, an inner Semitic derivation is possible only by inferring a common original meaning: an *'ebhyon* is a man who wants something which he does not have, and consequently a man who is needy and poor. Against this, Humbert (2) emphasizes that *'ebhyon* has no exclusively privative or negative meaning. "Hence the meaning is both privative and positive: undoubtedly it means the poor, but to the extent that he manifests a desire, a wish, in other words to the extent that he begs.... The word expresses not only a deficiency, but also an expectation and a demand." Ugar. *'bynt* [4], "wretchedness, misery," [5] occurs in parallelism with *'nḫ;* people from the city of *ʒll* are called *'bynm.* [6] Baumgartner, Aistleitner, Gordon, Humbert, etc., connect Ugar. *'bynt* and *'bynm* with the Heb. *'ebhyon.* W. von Soden [7] has called attention to the complaint made to King Zimri-lim in the Letters of Women from Mari, which says *a-bi-ia-na-ku,* "I am a poor woman"; [8] he takes *abiyānum,* "poor," with the related meaning "afflicted, wretched," like Ugar. *'byn* and Heb. *'ebhyon,* as an "old Amoritic" word, which developed from a root *'bī,* "poor, needy," with the suffix *-n.* (b) Again, Th. O. Lambdin is the primary advocate

---

Kraus, *Psalmen,* I, Exkurs 3: "'Anī und 'Anāw," *BK,* XV/1 (³1966), 82f.; A. Kuschke, "Arm und reich im AT mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der nachexilischen Zeit," *ZAW,* 57 (1939), 31-57; E. Kutsch, *'anāwāh 'Demut', ein Beitrag zum Thema 'Gott und Mensch im AT'* (unpubl. inaugural diss., 1960); C. van Leeuwen, *Le développement du sens social en Israël avant l'ère chrétienne. Studia Semitica Neerlandica,* 1 (1955); J. Loeb, *La littérature des pauvres dans la Bible* (Paris, 1892); J. Maier, *Die Armenfrömmigkeit. Texte vom Toten Meer,* II (1960), 83-87; G. Marschall, *Die 'Gottlosen' des ersten Psalmenbuches* (1929); S. Mowinckel, *Psalmenstudien,* I, *Åwän und die individuellen Klagepsalmen* (1921), 113-122; P. A. Munch, "Einige Bemerkungen zu den 'anijjim und den reša'im in den Psalmen," *Le Monde Oriental* (1936), 13-26; *idem,* "Das Problem des Reichtums in den Psalmen 37, 49, 73," *ZAW,* 55 (1937), 36-45; Pedersen, *ILC;* J. van der Ploeg, "Les pauvres d'Israël et leur piété," *OTS,* 7 (1950), 236-270; A. Rahlfs, *'Ani und 'anaw in den Psalmen* (1892); E. Renan, *History of the People of Israel,* III (1891), 31-40; N. H. Ridderbos, *De 'werkers der ongerechtigheid' in de individueele Psalmen* (Kampen, 1939); H. Schmidt, *Das Gebet der Angeklagten im AT. BZAW,* 49 (1928); K. Schwarzwaller, *Die Feinde des Individuums in den Psalmen* (unpubl. diss., 1963); W. Staerk, "Die Gottlosen in den Psalmen. Ein Beitrag zur alttestamentlichen Religionsgeschichte," *ThStKr,* 70 (1897), 449-488; J. J. Stamm, *Das Leiden der Unschuldigen in Babylon und Israel. AThANT,* 10 (1946); H. Steiner, *Die Gē'im in den Psalmen* (unpubl. diss., Bern-Lausanne, 1925); de Vaux, *AncIsr,* 72-74; C. Westermann, *The Praise of God in the Psalms* (trans. 1965); *idem,* "Struktur und Geschichte der Klage im AT," *ZAW,* 66 (1954), 44-80=*ThB,* 24 (1964), 266-305; H. W. Wolff, *Amos' geistige Heimat. WMANT,* 18 (1964).

1 *KBL*³.

2 Leslau, *Contributions,* 9; Lexicon, 378b.

3 W. W. Müller, *Die Wurzeln Mediae und Tertiae Y/W im Altsüdarabischen* (diss., Tübingen, 1962), 25.

4 *CTA,* 17 [II D], I, 17.

5 Gordon, *UT,* Glossary, No. 24.

6 *UT,* 313, 6.

7 "Zur Herkunft von hebr. 'ebjon 'arm'," *MIO,* 15/2 (1969), 322-26.

8 *ARM,* X = *Theologisches Literaturblatt,* 31 (1967), No. 37. 23; 44. 10.

Éléments sous droits d'auteur

of the view that *ʾebhyon* is derived from Egyptian.[9] According to Erman-Grapow, there are examples of occurrences of *byn* from the end of the Old Kingdom on: referring to persons, *byn* means "worthless, sluggish, to be in a wretched condition, evil," referring to harmful animals, "malicious, dangerous," referring to abstract things or ideas, "evil, bad, pernicious"; "the Evil One," "the Evil," plural "evil deeds," "calamity." According to Lambdin, Copt. *bōōn,* "wicked" (fem. *boone*), and *ebyēn,* "wretched, miserable," belong to the root *byn.* With W. F. Albright,[10] he accepts a phonetic development from *(e)būne(w)* to *ʾěbyūne* (> Heb. *ʾebhyon*) to *ʾebyēn.* Because of the vowel change from *ū* to *ē* in Late Egyptian and because of the o-vowel in Heb. *ʾebhyon,* the borrowing cannot have been later than the twelfth century. *ʾebhyon* with a degrading meaning would have been transferred to a specific class of Semitic (Canaanite) workers, "very possibly in connection with shipping and shipping crews."[11] Other Coptologists, as W. Spiegelberg,[12] W. Westendorf,[13] separate *ebyēn* from *bōōn* etymologically and argue that *ebyēn* was borrowed from Heb. *ʾebhyon;* W. von Soden agrees with this view.[14]

2. *Occurrences.* *ʾebhyon* occurs 61 times in the Hebrew OT: Ex. 23:6,11 (the Book of the Covenant) twice; Dt. 7 times; 1 S. 2:8 (Hannah's Song of Praise); Est. 9:22; Am. 5 times; Isa. 5 times (14:30; 25:4; 29:19; 32:7; 41:17[?]); Jer. 4 times; Ezk. 3 times; Pss. 23 times (not 33 times); Prov. 4 times; Job 6 times. While *ʾebhyon* does indeed occur in the Book of the Covenant, it does not appear in the J and E traditions or in the Deuteronomistic history (except in Hannah's Song of Praise in 1 S. 2:8); it is also notably absent in the Priestly Code. The occasional use of this word in the prophets (17 times) in comparison with the 23 occurrences in the Psalms is also striking.

3. *Semantic Field of "Poor" in the OT.* Besides *ʾebhyon,* there are several words for "poor" in the OT: → דל *dāl* 48 times; *dalal* 6 times; *dallah/dallath* in conjunction with *ʿam* or *ʾerets* 5 times; *misken* 6 times (4 times in Eccl. and twice in Sir.); → עני *ʿanî* 74 times; *ʿanav* 20 times; *ʿani,* "distress, oppressed condition" 36 times; *ʿanavah,* "humility" 4 times; *ʿenuth* once; *rash* 21 times; *rush* 3 times; *rish* 8 times (7 times in Prov. and once in Sir.); *chaser,* "to decrease, lack" 23 times; *chaser,* "one who has too little" 17 times; → חסר *cheser* twice; *choser* 3 times; *chesron* once; *machsor* 13 times.

4. *Relationships of the Words for "Poor."* *ʾebhyon* often appears in the stereotyped formula *ʿani veʾebhyon,* "poor and needy": Dt. 24:14; Jer. 22:16; Ezk. 16:49; 18:12; 22:29; Ps. 35:10 (some conjecture that *ʿani* should be deleted

---

9 "Egyptian Loan Words in the OT," *JAOS,* 73 (1953), 145-155, here 145f.
10 *Vocalization of the Egyptian Syllabic Orthography* (1934), 18.
11 Lambdin, 146.
12 *Koptisches Handwörterbuch* (1921), 23, n. 12.
13 *Koptisches Handwörterbuch* (1965), 24f.
14 *MIO,* 15/2 (1969), 323.

Éléments sous droits d'auteur

5. *din ʿani veʾebhyon As "Knowledge of God" in Jeremiah.* As in Amos, so in Jeremiah *ʾebhyon* means the socially poor, who, according to 5:28, has to suffer under the fat and sleek rich, because they do not judge with justice the cause of the fatherless and do not defend the rights of the needy. By way of contrast, King Josiah is praised in 22:16 because "he judged the cause of the poor and needy" *(dan din ʿani veʾebhyon);* the prophet calls this just and socially righteous behavior a true knowledge of God *(daʿath ʾothi).*[23] Cf. also the dubious expression *dam naphshoth ʾebhyonim neqiyyim* in Jer. 2:34.

When the prophet in Jer. 20:13, at the end of a lament over his personal struggles, confesses his confidence that Yahweh delivers (*hitstsil*) the life of the needy (*ʾebhyon*) from the hand of the evildoers, thereby designating himself as an *ʾebhyon,* then *ʾebhyon* here has a religious sense as in the Individual Laments. George says: "This is the way he speaks of his weakness in contrast to the terrible power of his enemies, but also of the absolute ease with which he has been saved (I 17-19; XV 19-21; XXVI 20-24)."[24] The genuineness of the praise in v. 13 is disputed.[25]

6. *Oppression of the ʾebhyon As ʾaven and toʿebhah in Ezekiel.* In Ezk. 18:12, the oppression of the poor and needy *(ʿani veʾebhyon honah)* is listed among the abominable things *(toʿebhoth)* of a violent son *(ben parits)* which are punishable by death. This list also includes robbery (cf. Lev. 19:13), refusing to restore the garment taken in pledge (Ex. 22:25f.[26f.]; Dt. 24:10-13,17), lending at interest, and taking increase (cf. Ezk. 22:12; Ex. 22:24[25]; Dt. 23:20f.; Lev. 25:36f.). The social catalog of the works of the righteous in Ezk. 18:6-8 includes, in addition, giving bread to the hungry, covering the naked with a garment, and executing true justice between man and man (cf. Ex. 23:6-8; Dt. 16:18-20). According to the sermon against the ruling classes in 22:25-30 (from the period after 587[26]), the landed gentry in Judah committed extortion (*ʿosheq*), robbery, oppression (*honu*) of the poor and needy, and extortion (*ʿashaq*) of the sojourner without redress. Cf. also the guilt (*ʿavon*) of Sodom in 16:49: pride, surfeit of food, prosperous ease, and failing to aid the poor and needy. Also in Ezekiel, the *ʾebhyon* (as also the *ʿani*) is a socially and legally deprived person, whose economic or legal oppression the prophet denounces as *ʿavon* (16:49) or *toʿebhah* (18:12; 16:49?).

7. *The King As the Advocate of the ʾebhyon.* According to Ps. 72, the ideal king is given Yahweh's righteousness in order that he may judge Yahweh's people with righteousness (vv. 1f.). As advocate and last court of appeal, "he shall defend the cause of the poor of the people *(ʿaniyye ʿam),* give deliverance to the needy *(yoshiaʿ libhne ʾebhyon),* and crush the oppressor" (v. 4). The king's world dominion (vv. 8-11) is the reward for his just and social rule (vv. 13f.). The verbs

---

[23] Cf. G. J. Botterweck, *Gott erkennen. BBB,* 2 (1951); *idem,* in J. B. Bauer *Bibeltheologisches Wörterbuch,* I (³1967), 320ff.

[24] George, 393.

[25] Cf. W. Rudolph, *HAT,* 12 (³1968), *in loc.*

[26] W. Zimmerli, *BK,* XIII/1, 523.

Copyrighted material

ʾoyebh (Ps. 9:4,7[3,6]; 35:19; 69:5,19[4,18]), *tsorer* (69:20[19]), evildoers or wicked (→ רשע *rāshāʿ* – 9:6,17f.[5,16f.]; 10:4; 12:9[8]; 140:5,9[4,8]), those who hate (*sone'* – 9:14[13]; 35:19; 69:5,15[4,14]; 86:17; *sone' tsaddiq* – 34:22[21]; cf. 37:12,32; 112:10), persecutors (*rodheph* – 35:3; 109:16), ruthless men (*ʿarits* – 86:14; cf. 37:35), violent men (*ʾish chamasim* – 140:2,5[1,4]), despoilers (*gozel* – 35:10), plunderers (*bazaz* – 109:11), and creditors (*nosheh* – 109:11). They fight against (*lacham* – 35:1) the poor or seek after his life (*mebhaqqesh nephesh* – 35:4; cf. 70:3[2]; 86:14) with a net (10:9; 35:7f.; 140:6[5]), a pit (35:7f.), or a snare (140:6[5]). They are dangerous like lions (*ʾari* – 35:17), serpents *(nachash),* and vipers (*ʿakhshubh* – 140:4[3]). Against the *ʾebhyon,* they behave themselves arrogantly (*ge'eh* – 140:6[5]), magnify themselves (*maghdil ʿalai* – 35:26), and are strong (*chazaq* – 35:10). As evil men (*ʾadham raʿ* – 140:2[1]), they devise evil (*choshebh raʿathi* – 35:4; cf. 35:20) against the *ʾebhyon,* rejoice *(sameach)* at their calamity (35:26), and desire *(chaphets)* their hurt (40:15[14]). They insult (*choreph* – 69:10[9]; cf. 69:3,10f.,20f.[2,9f.,19f.]; 109:25; cf. also 74:10,18,22) and make great boasts (*ʾish lashon* – 12:4[3]) with sharp (140:4[3]) or flattering tongue (12:3[2]), under which are mischief and iniquity (10:7), and which they make sharp as a serpent (140:4[3]); their mouth is filled with cursing (10:7). Finally, they seek deceitful witnesses (*ʿedh chamas* – 35:11), those who contend (*ribh* – 35:1) and those who condemn (*shophet* – 109:31), to convict the innocent *ʾebhyon.* This characterization of the "enemies" is derived from the sphere of one's fellow men, from the judicial system, from practices in war and hunting, and from chaos and the Underworld.

The references to the *ʾebhyonim* in the Individual Psalms of Lament are not sufficient to solve the old and new controversies concerning the "enemies": the shades of meaning inherent in these descriptions of the enemies are too varied to determine whether they are to be interpreted generally as external or internal enemies who pose a danger to the state, [34] or as a specific group or faction who oppose the godly, [35] or as sorcerers, demons, etc. [36] The question of whether the persecution of the enemies is the real cause of the miserable condition of the complaining worshipper, or only the result of some other deeper distress which appears to the worshipper as a sign that God is angry with him and has forsaken him, while giving occasion to the adversary to assault him with persecution, scorn, insults, slander, etc., is just as difficult and insoluble. The worshipper attributes his distress as well as his deliverance to God: cf. Ps. 69:27(26): "they persecute him whom thou hast smitten, and him whom thou hast wounded, they afflict still more."

2. *Affliction, Illness, Loneliness, Nearness to Death.* The destitution of the *ʾebhyon* is to be inferred from the whole tenor of the appropriate psalms: it manifests itself in affliction, illness, loneliness, and nearness to death: thus, the

---

[34] Birkeland.
[35] Hupfeld, Graetz, Causse, R. Smend, Duhm.
[36] Mowinckel, Pedersen, Nikolski, Brock-Utne. This uncertainty is shared by Schwarzwäller, Keel, H. Goeke.

Materiál chráněný autorskými právy

the poor are despoiled" *(mishshodh ʿaniyyim),* "because the needy groan" *(meʾeneqath ʾebhyonim*–12:6[5]). In the expression of certainty that Yahweh will hear in 140:13(12), Yahweh maintains "the cause of the afflicted" *(din ʿani)* and "executes justice for the needy" *(mishpat ʾebhyonim),* and then the "righteous" *(tsaddiqim)* give thanks for the righteous help and the "upright" *(yesharim)* dwell in his presence (v. 14[13]). In 9:19(18), the worshipper declares his confidence that the *ʾebhyon* shall not always be forgotten and the "hope of the poor" *(tiqvath ʿanavim)* shall not perish for ever; according to v. 11(10), "they put their trust in thee" *(yibhtechu bhekha),* "they know thy name," for thou hast not forsaken "those who seek thee" (*doreshekha*); Yahweh's favorable hearing of the "meek" (*ʿanavim*–10:17) is connected with doing justice to the "fatherless and the oppressed" (*yathom vadhakh*–v. 18).

On the basis of *parallelismus membrorum* and of usage in other contexts, we find that the *ʾebhyon* of the Individual Psalms of Lament is connected not only with the *ʿani* or *ʿanav* ("the poor"), but also with those who are designated as *ʿebhedh,* "servant" (86:2; 109:28), *chasidh,* "godly" (12:2[1]; 86:2), *ʾemunim,* "faithful" (12:2[1]), *tsaddiqim,* "righteous" (140:14[13]), *yesharim,* "upright" (140:14[13]), or "the quiet in the land" *(righʿe ʾerets*–35:20). They seek Yahweh *(biqqesh*–40:17[16] = 70:5[4]; 69:7[6]; *darash*–9:11[10]), love *(ʾahabh)* his salvation (40:17[16] = 70:5[4]), trust in him (9:11[10]; 86:2), hope *(qavah)* in him (69:7[6]), know his name (9:11[10]) or love his name (69:37[36]).

4. *Yahweh, Deliverer of the ʾebhyonim.* Yahweh is the deliverer of the *ʾebhyonim.* In the Individual Psalms of Lament, the believing hope and the certainty that Yahweh will give a favorable hearing is expressed by referring to the divine deliverance: Yahweh is the hope of the afflicted *(ʿanayim),* who does not forget the needy *(ʾebhyonim)* (9:13,19[12,18]); he is a stronghold for the oppressed *(misgabh laddakh*–9:10[9]) and a strong deliverer *(ʿoz yeshuʿathi*–140:8[7]). Cf. also *maʿoz laddal,* "a stronghold to the poor," or *laʾebhyon,* "to the needy," in Isa. 25:4. In cries for help and statements expressing a feeling of the certainty of deliverance, the following verbs describing the activity of the divine deliverer appear[38]: *gaʾal,* "redeem" (69:19[18]); *yashaʿ* in the hiphil, "save" (12:2[1]; 69:36[35]; 86:2,16; 109:26,31) from evildoers or judges, or *yashaʿ, yeshuʿah,* "deliver, deliverance" (12:6[5]; 35:3,9; 69:30[29]; 140:8[7]); *natsal* in the hiphil, "deliver" (35:10; 69:15[14]; 70:2[1]; 40:14[13]; 86:13; 140:2[1]; *palat* in the piel, "deliver" (70:6[5]; 40:18[17]). Cf. also Ps. 82:4. The oppressed worshipper asks for protection: *saghabh,* "set on high" (69:30[29]); *shamar,* "preserve" (86:2; 140:5[4]); *natsar,* "preserve" (140:5[4]). Yahweh is helper and help (*ʿezer* or *ʿezrah*–10:14; 35:2; 70:2,6[1,5]; 40:14,18[13,17]; 86:17; 109:26); he stands at the right hand of the needy (*ʿamadh limin*–109:31), gives him strength (*nathan ʿoz*–86:16), strengthens his heart (*kun*–10:17), covers his head (*sakhah*–140:8[7]), saves his life (*hashibh*–35:17), and gives him life (86:17). This hope and confidence is based on the *ʾebhyon*'s faith in God: Yahweh is good (86:5),

---

[38] Cf. J. J. Stamm, *Erlösen und Vergeben* (1940); Chr. Barth, *Die Errettung vom Tode,* 124-146.

Materiál chráněný autorskými právy

to deliverance which refer to this supposed institution, Pss. 3, 4, 5, 7, 11, 17, 23, 26, 27, 57 and 63, *'ebhyon* does not occur; according to Beyerlin, there is no reference, or at least no sure reference, to the sacral-legal institution in Pss. 9-10, 12, 86, 140. But even if one is not able to show clearly any specific legal institution for our Individual Psalms of Lament, still it can be established that they were spoken in the Yahweh sanctuary on Zion. Here the oppressed begged for divine gifts, help, and deliverance, as well as legal aid and a righteous judgment (cf. 9:6-9,16f.,18-21[5-8,15f.,17-20]; 10:12-15,16-18; 35:23f.; 140:13[12]).

In the Psalm of Praise (Ps. 113) and Hannah's Song of Praise (1 S. 2:1-10),[42] the psalmist declares that Yahweh raises the poor *(dal)* from the dust and lifts the needy *('ebhyon)* from the ash heap to make them sit with princes and inherit a seat of honor (*kisse' khabhodh*). According to the context, the *dal* and the *'ebhyon* belong to the same group as the feeble, hungry, poor, and godly; Yahweh has exalted them. Cf. Lk. 1:46-55 par.

5. 'ebhyon in Late Prophetic Proclamations of Salvation. The proclamation of salvation for the *'aniyyim* (and *'ebhyonim*–Isa. 41:17-20), who have to seek water in vain during a drought and suffer thirst, contains Yahweh's promise that he will answer them and not forsake them; vv. 18f. connect the situation with the miraculous exodus, in which Yahweh will give the wilderness abundant water (cf. also Isa. 43:20; 48:21; 49:10; Ex. 17:1-7; Nu. 20:2-13). Here also the *'aniyyim* and the *'ebhyonim* are in need of divine help and salvation. According to the oracle concerning the Philistines in Isa. 14:28-32, which with Duhm is probably to be dated after the battle of Issus and before the conquest of Tyre and Gaza by Alexander, after the downfall of the enemies in Philistia, the *dallim,* "poor," will feed on Yahweh's pasture (read *bekhari,* "in my pasture," instead of *bekhore,* "first-born") and the *'ebhyonim,* "needy," will lie down in safety; according to 14:32b, the "afflicted of his people" feel that they have found refuge in Zion which the Lord has founded. Here the people of Yahweh are designated as *dallim* and *'ebhyonim,* or *'aniyye 'ammo.* The *dallim, 'ebhyonim,* and *'aniyyim* receive Yahweh's special attention; they enjoy his special care.

In the (secondary) promise in Isa. 29:17-24, according to v. 19 the *'anavim* and the *'ebhyonim* shall obtain fresh joy and exult, for with the cosmic transformation the ruthless *('arits),* the scoffer, and those who watch to do evil *(shoqedhe 'aven)* shall be no more; according to v. 21, the latter are described as those who by a word make a man out to be an offender, lay a snare for the arbitrator in the gate, and with an empty plea turn aside him who is in the right *(tsaddiq).* The *'anavim* and the *'ebhyonim* will rejoice because they are redeemed from ruthlessness, calamity, faultfinding, and legal obstacles. But these passages pertain not merely to those who are oppressed materially and legally; rather, they are oriented (still under the promise) entirely to the fulfilment of the promise of Yahweh, to his salvation.

---

[42] Cf. Westermann, *Praise,* 124f.

Materiál chráněný autorskými právy

days of mourning shall be ended," Isa. 60:20), the mourning is said to be "made" (*ʿasah ʾebhel*–Gen. 50:10; Jer. 6:26; Ezk. 24:17). The external character of mourning also appears in expressions like "mourning garments" (*bighedhe ʾebhel*–2 S. 14:2; *ʾebhel maʿateh*–Isa. 61:3), "mourning bread" (*lechem ʿal ʾebhel*–Jer. 16:7?), "house of mourning" (*beth ʾebhel*–Eccl. 7:2,4). Special intensity in observing mourning customs is designated by adding descriptive statements like "great" (*ʾebhel gadhol*–Est. 4:3), "grievous" (*ʾebhel kabhedh*–Gen. 50:11), "as for an only son" (*ʾebhel yachidh*–Jer. 6:26; Am. 8:10), "as one who laments his mother" (*ʾabhel ʾem*–Ps. 35:14?); intensity is also expressed by the number of those who are perplexed: usually individuals, but also the entire people (e.g., 1 S. 6:19; 2 S. 19:3[2]; 2 Ch. 35:24). Now, whereas *ʾabhal* ordinarily refers to the observance of external mourning customs, in 2 S. 14:2 it is used to designate feigned mourning. Thus, it is best to translate *ʾabhal* "to be in mourning," i.e., to observe the period of mourning with its attendant customs, when it is connected with mourning for the dead. In no way does this exclude the inner feeling; Job 29:25 speaks of comforting mourners.

III. Usage in Connection with Announcements of Judgment.

1. *General Usage or Usage with Reference to People.* When *ʾabhal* is used in connection with calamities (1 S. 6:19), it can be understood as mourning over those who have perished. This does not apply where there are no dead to be mourned in the calamity (Neh. 1:4), when a passage is dealing with an event affecting nature (Isa. 33:9), or when a calamity is announced for the future (Est. 4:3). This use of *ʾabhal* is clearly distinguished from mourning for the dead. Here again, the word refers not so much to the feeling of sorrow, but to the external behavior; and again the customs connected with mourning for the dead are mentioned in connection with *ʾabhal* (sackcloth and fasting–Joel. 1:10ff.; sitting on the ground–Isa. 3:26; baldness–Am. 8:10; in addition Ezr. 10:6; Neh. 1:4; Est. 4:3; Ps. 35:13f.; Jer. 6:26; and Mic. 1:8 contain more or less complete descriptions of mourning customs), and statements concerning periods of time occur (Neh. 1:4; three weeks: Dnl. 10:2). Here *ʾabhal* occurs in passages which contain announcements of judgment, as a reaction to judgments which had already been executed or were about to be executed (1 S. 6:19; Neh. 1:4; Isa. 3:26; 19:8; 24:4,7; 33:9; Jer. 4:28; 14:2; Lam. 1:4; 2:8; Hos. 10:5; Joel 1:9f.), or to the threat of judgment (Ex. 33:4; Nu. 14:39; 1 S. 15:35; 16:1; Ezr. 10:6; Est. 4:3; 6:12; Job 14:22; Ps. 35:14; Jer. 6:26; 12:4,11; 23:10; Ezk. 7:12,27; 31:15; Am. 1:2; 5:16; 8:8; 9:5; Mic. 1:8). That this represents a reaction is emphasized by introductory formulas like "when I heard" (*keshomʿi*–Neh. 1:4; 8:9; cf. Ex. 33:4) or "for this" (*ʿal zoth*–Jer. 4:28; Am. 8:8; Mic. 1:8; cf. Hos. 4:3).

The difference between this usage and that pertaining to mourning for the dead can be seen in 2 S. 12:15ff., although *ʾabhal* does not appear in this passage: as long as the child is sick, David engages in all customs which are connected with *ʾabhal* in other passages; but after the child is dead, he stops. He defends his behavior by reasoning that as long as the child was alive, perhaps God could

Материјал заштићен ауторским правима

in Gen. 49:24 together with the old term יעקב → אביר *'ābhîr ya'aqobh,* "the Mighty One of Jacob." As the ancient narratives show, a stone could serve as a symbol for God. But later, the conflict of the prophets with the old gods of Canaan and with other gods of neighboring peoples made this idea impossible in Israel. The prophetic polemic against idolatry occasionally inveighs against the worship of stone and tree (Jer. 2:27; 3:9; Ezk. 20:32; Dnl. 5:4,23; cf. Isa. 37:19 and the prohibition against cultic stones in Lev. 26:1). The later allusion to "holy stones" (*'abhne qodhesh*–Lam. 4:1) has reference to stones of the sanctuary on Zion which had been destroyed.

The divine epithet *'ebhen yisra'el,* "Stone (Rock) of Israel," is usually explained by taking *tsor,* "rock," as a designation for God. But Dahood does not find any exact parallel to this epithet and completely eliminates it from the text by emendation.

According to Isa. 8:14f., Yahweh will become a stone of offense and a rock of stumbling to Israel. In spite of the figures based on hunting in these verses, the two statements have to do with the likelihood that one who is travelling at night might stumble over stones and fall (cf. Ps. 91:12). Zec. 12:3 figuratively refers to a heavy stone which young people used to test their strength. It is likely that a proverbial expression lies behind Ps. 118:22, "The stone which the builders rejected has become the head of the corner," i.e., the person who was despised has gained respect through humiliation and insult. Isa. 28:16 speaks of a corner-stone, which is called → אבן בחן *'ebhen bōchan,* "a tested stone," which gives confidence to the believer. This verse, like Ps. 118:22, is explained in the NT as referring to the Messiah.

In Isa. 28:16, Galling finds a figurative use of the technical building term "cornerstone" or "angle joint," [8] while Jeremias thinks the idea here is based on the cornerstone of the temple (*'ebhen shethiyyah,* "stone of drinking"), which holds back the water of the flood. [9] The problem is that we do not know whether this idea, which appears for the first time in Rabbinic literature, was known in the time of Isaiah. In any case, this passage corresponds very well with Isaiah's emphasis on the Zion traditions.

Kapelrud

---

8 *Ibid.*, 72f.
9 Jeremias, 73.

Материјал заштићен ауторским правима

אַבְרָהָם *'abhrāhām*

Contents: I. The Meaning of the Name. II. History: 1. General Considerations; 2. Patriarch; 3. Founder of a Cult; 4. Covenant Partner. III. Theological Development: 1. JE; 2. Deuteronomy; 3. The Psalms and the Prophets; 4. The P Document and the Chronicler.

I. The Meaning of the Name. In Gen. 17:5, *'abhraham* is explained from the perspective of popular etymology as being from *'abh* + *hamon,* "father of a multitude." Moreover, this is connected with the change of his name from *'abhram* to *'abhraham.* However, none of the scholarly interpretations of this word justifies such a linguistic history. The introduction of the consonant *he* into the name *'abhram* simply amounts to another legitimate way of writing it under the influence of a different dialect.[1] Etymologically, there are three possible explanations for the name *'abhraham.* (1) If it is connected with Akk. *Abam-rāmā,*[2] "love the father," it is a summons to the newborn child and his brothers and sisters. (2) But it is more likely that *rām* is to be understood in the

'abhrāhām. W. F. Albright, "The Names Shaddai and Abram," *JBL,* 54 (1935), 173-204; *idem, Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan* (London, 1968), 47-95; Alt, *GF;* K. T. Andersen, "Der Gott meines Vaters," *StTh,* 16 (1962), 170-188; H. Cazelles, "Patriarches," *DBS,* 7 (1966), 31-156; R. E. Clements, *Abraham and David. Genesis XV and its Meaning for Israelite Tradition. SBT,* N.S. 5 (1967); G. Cornfeld, ed., *Pictorial Biblical Encyclopedia* (1964), 559-568; German ed. G. J. Botterweck, *Die Bibel und ihre Welt* (1969), 1135-1153; F. M. Cross, "Yahweh and the God of the Patriarchs," *HThR,* 55 (1962), 225-259; O. Eissfeldt, "El und Jahwe," *JSS,* 1 (1956), 25-37=*KlSchr,* III (1966), 386-397; *idem,* "Jahwe, der Gott der Väter," *ThLZ,* 88 (1963), 481-490=*KlSchr,* IV (1968), 79-91; K. Galling, *Die Erwählungstraditionen Israels. BZAW,* 48 (1928); C. H. Gordon, "Abraham and the Merchants of Ura," *JNES,* 17 (1958), 28-31; *idem, The World of the OT* (1958), 117-124; *idem,* "Hebrew Origins in the Light of Recent Discovery," in A. Altmann, ed., *Biblical and Other Studies* (London, 1963), 3-14; H. Gunkel, "Abraham," *RGG*², I, 65-68; M. Haran, "The Religion of the Patriarchs," *ASTI,* 4 (1965), 30-55; J. Hoftijzer, *Die Verheissungen an die drei Erzväter* (Leiden, 1956); J. M. Holt, *The Patriarchs of Israel* (Nashville, 1964); A. Jepsen, "Zur Überlieferungsgeschichte der Vätergestalten," *WZ* Leipzig, 3 (1953/1954), 265-281; A. S. Kapelrud, "Hvem var Abraham?" *NTT,* 64 (1963), 163-174; R. Kilian, *Die vorpriesterlichen Abrahamsüberlieferungen. BBB,* 24 (1966); N. Lohfink, *Die Landverheissung als Eid. SBS,* 28 (1967); *idem,* "Die Religion der Patriarchen und die Konsequenzen für eine Theologie der nichtchristlichen Religionen," *Bibelauslegung im Wandel* (1967), 107-128; L. Rost, "Die Gottesverehrung der Patriarchen im Lichte der Pentateuchquellen," *SVT,* 7 (1960), 346-359; H. H. Rowley, "Recent Discovery and the Patriarchal Age," *The Servant of the Lord* (Oxford, ²1965), 281-318; R. de Vaux, *Die hebräischen Patriarchen und die modernen Entdeckungen* (1961); *idem, Die Patriarchenerzählungen und die Geschichte. SBS,* 3 (1965); M. Weidmann, *Die Patriarchen und ihre Religion. FRLANT,* 94 (1968); A. Weiser, "Abraham," *RGG*³, I, 68-71; W. Zimmerli, "Sinaibund und Abrahambund, Gottes Offenbarung," *Gesammelte Aufsätze* (1963), 205-216.

[1] H. Bauer, *ZAW,* 48 (1930), 75; J. A. Montgomery, *JBL,* 46 (1927), 144.
[2] Stamm, *AN,* 103, 291f.

Materiál chránený autorskými právy

the Judean tribes which settled in the neighborhood of Hebron, especially the Calebites (cf. Josh. 15:13ff.). Abraham's elevation to ancestor of all Israel could not have taken place until a time when Judah and Israel were more closely connected and Judah was the dominant portion. This points to the Davidic kingdom and to the period of the Davidic-Solomonic empire.

As the ancestor of all Israel, Abraham appears as a military leader (Gen. 14:14), a priestly intercessor for his people (18:22f.–J), a prophet (20:7–E), and an example of human piety and human obedience to God (Gen. 22–J). It is worthy of note that the figure of Abraham dominates the patriarchal traditions and has partly displaced the figure of Isaac.

3. *Founder of a Cult.* In connection with his role as the great ancestor of the people of Israel, Abraham is represented in particular as the founder of a cult. We are told that he built altars at Shechem (Gen. 12:6–J), Bethel (12:8–J), and Beer-sheba (21:33–J), in addition to the altar at Mamre (13:18; 18:1ff.–J). The establishment of the altar at Beer-sheba was actually a part of the Isaac tradition (cf. 26:25–J), which was transferred to Abraham.[10] The traditions of the establishment of the altars at Shechem and Bethel were originally connected with Jacob (28:19–E; 33:19f.–E) and were attributed to Abraham later when he began to be regarded as the great ancestor of all Israel.[11] Therefore, Abraham's role as founder of a cult must be connected primarily with Hebron-Mamre.

The question of the nature of patriarchal religion is still a subject of scholarly discussion. Alt interpreted the patriarchal religion as primarily a tribal religion, in which the deities were designated by the eponym by which they were first revealed. Thus, "the God (or "Shield," Gen. 15:1) of Abraham" was the deity that was worshipped by the Abraham tribe. Essentially, this was the religion of a nomadic family without any direct connection with a definite, permanent sanctuary. It belonged to the nomadic sphere outside the cultivated land. The tradition that Abraham built the altar at Mamre arose first among Abraham's descendants when they came into the cultivated land. With a minor modification of Alt's well-known view, H. G. May and K. T. Andersen have proposed a cult of "the God of my Father." On the whole, this cult contains the same characteristics as that suggested by Alt, except that the name of the patriarch is not specifically mentioned in the divine name. O. Eissfeldt strongly emphasizes the contrast between the gods worshipped by the patriarchs in Mesopotamia (Gen. 35:1-7; Josh. 24:2,14f.) and the El-deities which are always connected with the land of Canaan. The differences between the religio-cultic and the tribal-popular interests among the patriarchs that immigrated into Canaan are worthy of note. While great importance is placed on the Mesopotamian or Aramaic origin of the wives of the patriarchs, in religio-cultic matters Israel's attitude toward Canaan is completely positive. In the cult traditions of the patriarchal narratives, the El-deities are manifest everywhere. E and P clearly affirm that Abraham first came into contact in Canaan with the God who later revealed himself to Moses as

---

10 Alt, 54; Jepsen, 276ff.
11 Jepsen.

Materiál chráněný autorskými právy

court circle in Jerusalem, the failure of the monarchy occasioned a fresh re-examination and a fresh return to Abraham as the recipient of the oath which had established the royal authority and power in Israel. While the covenant at Sinai-Horeb raised a question about Israel's future deliverance, since Israel had indeed transgressed the commandments (cf. Jer. 31:31-34; Ezk. 36:26-28), the Abraham covenant took on new significance as a unilateral divine oath, promising the growth of a national consciousness and possession of the land.

4. *The P Document and the Chronicler.* The most significant development in the priestly Abraham tradition is the new interpretation of the divine covenant with Abraham in Gen. 17. In this passage, the deity who makes the covenant bears the name El Shaddai; for it is part of the constant scheme of P that El Shaddai was the divine name which was used consistently from Abraham to Moses. The covenant is described as a *berith 'olam* ("an everlasting covenant"), a term used earlier for the tradition of the Davidic covenant (2 S. 23:5; cf. Isa. 55:3). This intensifies even more the description in J where the covenant is a unilateral divine oath. Now, the establishment of the monarchy is expressly included in the terms of the covenant, whereas earlier it was included only by implication. Also the threefold promise is changed somewhat: Abraham will become the father of a multitude of nations, his descendants will receive all the land of Canaan as an everlasting possession, and El Shaddai will be their God (Gen. 17:4-8). This last promise must be understood cultically, viz., as a reference to the divine *kabhodh* (glory) which dwells in the midst of Israel. P declares that this promise became a reality when the tabernacle was built after the revelation at Sinai. For P, the covenant with Abraham is the ever abiding covenant by which Israel lives. The Sinai event does not result in the establishment of a new covenant, but initiates the fulfilment of the promises which were made to Abraham.

The sign of this covenant is the rite of circumcision, which clearly is a religious rather than a social rite (Gen. 17:10-14). The importance of the making of this covenant is further emphasized by its connection with the changes of name from Abram to Abraham and from Sarai to Sarah (17:5,15). In P, the figure of Abraham is the historical beginning for the doctrine that the Jewish people are the subject of an eternal choice of God. This choice was verified by the rite of circumcision, and it could not be annulled by transgressing the laws given at Sinai.

In the Chronicler's work, the figure of Abraham is presented as an indication that Yahweh had chosen Israel and had given them the land, in harmony with the P tradition. The promise of the land is central (2 Ch. 20:7). In a psalm taken over by the Chronicler, this promise is considered to have been confirmed to the other two patriarchs, Isaac and Jacob (1 Ch. 16:15ff.). The reference to Yahweh as the "God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob" (29:18; 2 Ch. 30:6) is undoubtedly a reflection of this promise. Ezra's prayer in Neh. 9:6-37 alludes to the Abraham covenant, and in a way that indicates familiarity with the J and P accounts (note the allusions to the change of Abraham's name, Gen. 17:5[P], and the list of the inhabitants of Canaan which were added to the J account, 15:20f.).

Clements

Copyrighted material

her devotees, who refer to her as *ʾadhto,* "his lady." A Palmyrenian inscription dating from A.D. 142-143, published by Cantineau, seems to refer to a woman as *ʾadath,* "lady." [8] In this inscription, a man by the name of Māle states that he has made his grave "for himself, his wife *(laʾadhtah),* for his sons, for his daughters, and for his grandchildren."

Thousands of Punic inscriptions begin with the phrase *lerabbath lethinith pan baʿal velaʾadhon lebhaʿal chammon,* and thus are dedicated not only to Baʿal Hammon, who usually appears in the second part of the phrase, but also to the "lady Tinit, the face of Baʿal," whose dignity as lady is not expressed by *ʾadhath* here, but by *rabbath.* Transcriptions of the Punic *ʾadhon* into Greek and Latin have also been preserved for us. In a Punic inscription from the hill El-Hofra in the Algerian Constantine dating from the second century B.C., written in Greek letters, we find *l-adoun,* which is the Greek transliteration of the Punic *laʾadhon.* [9] Also, in verses 998-1001 of the "Poenulus" written by Plautus *ca.* 200 B.C., we find *donni,* which corresponds to the Punic *adoni,* "my lord," being shortened by the deletion of the initial *a.* But in these texts *adoun* refers to a god, viz., to *Bal Amoun,* which here is placed after "our lady Tinit, the face of Baʿal" *(rhubathōn thinith phane bal),* while the address *donni*=*ʾadhoni,* "my lord," is directed to a man.

3. *The OT.* In the OT, *ʾadhon* is used in reference to an earthly lord over 300 times and to a divine lord about 30 times, if we leave *ʾadhonāi* out of consideration. 2 S. 3:4, where David's son born to Haggith is named *ʾadhoniyyah* or (as his name is spelled in other passages) *ʾadhoniyyahu,* "my lord is Yahweh," is the oldest example that can be dated with certainty where Israel employed the concept of *ʾadhon.* It is possible that Israel had already called its heavenly lord or a human lord *ʾadhon* earlier than this. But the passages which assume that this title was used at an earlier time, like Gen. 42:10, where the brothers of Joseph, not knowing who he was, address him as "my lord" *(ʾadhoni)* and refer to themselves as "your servants" *(ʿabhadhekha)* in relationship to him, or like Ex. 23:17, where God at Sinai commands all the males of Israel to appear "before the Lord Yahweh" *(ʾel pene haʾadhon yhvh)* three times a year, may have transferred a later usage of this word back into an earlier time. The OT speaks of the earthly lord over such things as wives (Gen. 18:12), lands (42:30), houses (45:8), districts (1 K. 16:24), and many similar things. Frequently the king is called *ʾadhon;* and in Jer. 22:18; 34:5, *hoy ʾadhon,* "Ah, lord," appears as a lament over the dead king. The plural of our word, *ʾadhonim,* does occur as a genuine plural, but often it has reference to an individual earthly lord as a *pluralis majestaticus* (plural of majesty). This may be the case in 1 K. 16:24, which speaks of "the owner of the hill" *(ʾadhone hahar),* and in Isa. 19:4, where the prophet warns the land of Egypt that it will fall into the hand of a "hard master" *(ʾadhonim qasheh).* In this latter case, then, the substantive is in the plural, whereas the singular is used for the appositional adjective. Generally speaking, *ʾadhon* seems

---

[8] J. Cantineau, *Syr,* 17 (1936), 354f.
[9] J. Friedrich, *ZDMG,* 107 (1957), 282-290.

prophetic books the use of *ʾadhonāi* (alone or in connection with *yhvh*) increases to 320 occurrences, of which the book of Ezekiel alone furnishes 217 examples. In the great majority of these passages *ʾadhonāi* is used in introductions, *koh ʾamar,* and in concluding formulas, *neʾum,* of prophetic oracles, e.g., Isa. 10:24, *koh ʾamar ʾadhonāi yhvh tsebhaʾoth,* "Thus says the Lord, Yahweh of hosts"; and 3:15, *neʾum ʾadhonāi yhvh tsebhaʾoth,* "says the Lord, Yahweh of hosts." In the Psalms, *ʾadhonāi* occurs 55 times, and in Lamentations, 14. Thus it is clear that *ʾadhonāi* and *ʾadhonāi yhvh* or *yhvh ʾadhonāi* are better adapted to speeches and prayers than they are to narratives, laws, and wisdom sayings.

2. *The Ending -āi.* In the word *ʾadhonāi,* everything depends on the explanation of its ending *-āi.* Some scholars interpret this ending as a substantive-afformative, regardless of the function it serves. Others think that it is the possessive pronominal suffix, first person singular, attached to the plural *ʾadhonim.* Under the assumption that the afformative *-āi* implies an intensification of the root word, it is argued that *ʾadhonāi* should be translated either "Lord of all" or "my lord." In the latter case, in view of the abundance of similar parallels such as Monsieur, Madame, Madonna, the possibility must always be left open that in *ʾadhonāi* there is a solidification of a vocative into a predicate nominative form. While Dalman could still say, "it is now generally accepted that in Old Testament literature *ʾadhonāi* was an independent name for God (like *ʾelohim* or *haʾelohim*) meaning 'the Lord,' 'the Lord of all'," [12] at the present time the opposite view enjoys virtually general recognition. This is due in particular to Dalman's *Studien,* and to Baudissin's work on *Kyrios* which was influenced by it. In fact, Baudissin said that this work was to be read in connection with Dalman's *Studien.* [13] More recent studies of this problem make it clear that at the present time the interpretation of the ending of *ʾadhonāi* as a possessive suffix dominates the field. Quell, after he has declared himself in favor of the pronominal nature of the suffix *-āi* in *ʾadhonāi,* says: "On the other hand, *ʾadhonāi* also occurs in we-texts (e.g., Ps. 44:24), so that it is impossible to take it as a possessive form 'my lord' in biblical texts unless one assumes that an original vocative has ossified as a nominative. Granted this assumption, one may assume ... that *ʾadhonāi* as a divine name had its origin as an address in private prayer.... The lengthening of the ā may be traced to the concern of the Massoretes to mark the word as sacred by a small external sign." [14] In support of his contention that the vocative *ʾadhonāi* was used to function as other cases, he appeals to Baudissin, who cited the late Heb. *rabbi,* Syr. *mari,* and Akk. *bēlti* as parallels to *ʾadhonāi.* [15] Köhler writes: "The divine name Yahweh occurs more than 6700 times in the OT. In speech, Judaism uses instead the word *ʾadhonāi,* the *pluralis excellentiae,* 'my Lord,' in the sense of 'my dominion,' and this expression has become such a fixed usage that it is best and most correctly translated 'the Lord.' This is the *kýrios* of

---

12 Dalman, 13.
13 Baudissin, II, 18.
14 *TDNT,* III, 1060f., n. 109.
15 Baudissin, II, 35ff.

Copyrighted material

without meaning." [21] In relation to the "introductions to the prophetic oracle" in particular, Dalman says further concerning the use of *ʾadhonāi* by the prophets: "'*adhonāi*, therefore, is completely in place; for the prophet speaks in the name of the one who sent him and who is thus his Lord in a particular sense. Moreover, *haʾadhon* by itself is familiar enough to Isaiah, who uses it five times. The same is true of the use of *ʾadhonāi* in the prophetic oracle," viz., it expresses the special relationship of the prophet to Yahweh, his Lord. "More special emphasis seems to be placed on the suffix particularly in 50:4,5,7,9; if so, the compounding of the divine name in this context is explained very well. The prophet refers to the fact that his God, who inspired him to speak, will also defend him against his enemies." [22] Dalman attempts to justify the deletion of Ezk. 13:9; 23:49; 24:24; 28:24; Job 28:28 on the one hand, and of 1 K. 2:26; 22:6; 2 K. 19:23 on the other. He reasons this way: "On the basis of the extant written material, one can hardly speak of a real history of the use of *ʾadhonāi* in the period covered by the OT books (leaving Daniel out of consideration), least of all of a transition from a conscious use of the suffix to a use of the suffix which has no significance. If we may assume, then, that the usage which is prevalent now was also the original usage, then we are justified in deleting those few passages where *ʾadhonāi* occurs in the mouth of God (4 times in Ezekiel and once in Job) and in ordinary historical narratives (3 times in the books of Kings). And if we disregard the book of Daniel, we find that *ʾadhonāi* is used in speeches of men to God or about God, which agrees with the usage of the profane *ʾadhoni*, and in certain instances emphasis may fall on the suffix to a greater or lesser degree." [23] Later in his work, Dalman again takes up this admission that the suffix on *ʾadhonāi* is weakened in significance when he writes: "'*adhonāi* was a natural substitute for *yhvh* because it often appears in the OT as an introduction to Yahweh.... At the same time, it must be assumed that the significance of the suffix was on the verge of disappearing, not because it was unknown, but because people were no longer concerned to express their own personal relationship to God, but rather their belief in his position as Lord. A man did not desire to call on *his* Lord, but on 'the *Lord*'." [24]

Dalman believed that these quotations from his *Studien* supported his thesis that the ending *-āi* was a possessive suffix and that the *ʾadhonāi* which had this suffix always assumed a personal relationship between the speaker and Yahweh. But the deletions or emendations of Ex. 15:17; Ezk. 13:9; 23:49; 24:24; 28:24; and Job 28:28 on the one hand, and of 1 K. 2:26; 22:6; and 2 K. 19:23 on the other, are arbitrary, which would not be necessary if *ʾadhonāi* were interpreted as a name meaning "the Lord of all" with *-āi* as the substantival afformative. With regard to the special relationship of service which the prophets Proto-Isaiah, Amos, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Deutero-Isaiah had to Yahweh and the explanation of their frequent use of *ʾadhonāi*, we have just as much, if not

---

[21] *Ibid.*, 34.
[22] *Ibid.*, 30.
[23] *Ibid.*, 33.
[24] *Ibid.*, 74.

Bahan dengan hak cipta

which clearly mean something like "full of power" and "full of might," the second in *hnny* and *ṯmny*, which describe the situation in which the authors of the letter assume that their readers have an interest, and the group of persons concerning whose condition they inquire, in the broadest possible terms, and thus probably they are to be rendered by "everything here" or "in this place," and "everything there" or "in that place." [32]

Just as the afformative *-āi* in these Ugaritic texts reinforces the meaning of a basic word and has nothing at all to do with a possessive suffix, so also with the ending of *'adhonāi*: basically it is a nominal afformative, which reinforces the meaning of the basic word *'adhon*, and the meanings "Lord" and "Lord of all" come from this. But we should probably reckon with the possibility advocated by Dalman, Baudissin, and others that in many passages that now have *'adhonāi* as an address to Yahweh, originally the reading was *'adhoni* or the *pluralis majestaticus* *'adhonai*. This seems to be the case, e.g., in Gen. 15:2, where Abraham asks Yahweh, "My Lord Yahweh, what wilt thou give me?" *('adhonāi yhvh mah titten li)*, or in Ex. 4:10, where Moses explains to Yahweh, "Oh, my Lord, I am not eloquent" *(bi 'adhonāi lo' 'ish debharim 'anokhi)*. If so, then the forms *'adhoni* and *'adhonai*, "my Lord," which refer to God, were changed later to *'adhonāi* in the course of the tendency to use them only in the secular sphere and to use *'adhonāi*, "the Lord of all," exclusively for Yahweh. For even the expression *'adhonāi 'elohai* in Ps. 38:16 (Eng. v. 15), where *'elohai*, "my God," comes immediately after *'adhonāi*, "Lord of all," and seems to suggest that the ending *-āi* should be interpreted as a possessive suffix and that this expression should be translated "my Lord," still can readily be understood as "my Lord of all." Thus, the special relationship of the worshipper to God need not be lost by adopting this explanation of *'adhonāi*. When a man addressed God as "Lord of all," he expressed his close relationship to God, for the LXX translators often render *'adhonāi* not by *kýriós mou*, "my Lord," but simply by *kýrios*, "Lord," indicating that by addressing God as "Lord" they felt a man was expressing the idea that God is the Lord of the worshipper. Nevertheless, inasmuch as *'adhonāi* in the Hebrew text often seems to have to mean "my Lord" because of the relationship between the worshipper and God demanded by the context, we are forced to interpret this as a late scribal alteration of the text from an original *'adhoni* or *'adhonai* to *'adhonāi*. But in spite of all this, it is still true that the overwhelming number of occurrences of this word demand that it be understood as a proper name, "Lord of all." Thus, in his above-quoted statements Baudissin is correct or *'adhonai*, "my Lord," to *'adhonāi*, the meaning of *'adhonāi* was changed to "Lord of all," [33] which, as we have already seen, [34] Dalman accepts for a later, but too late a time.

but which he dates much too late, as his own position suggests.

Still another phenomenon in the Ugaritic texts can make a contribution toward answering the question of the meaning and time of origin of the divine name

---

[32] Similarly, L. Delekat, *Asylie und Schutzorakel am Zionheiligtum* (1967), 369, n. 6.
[33] Baudissin, II, 31.
[34] See above, II.3.

Bahan dengan hak cipta

Yahweh, be not silent!" "O Adonai, be not far from me!" 38:16(15) (where *ʾadhonāi* is neither to be deleted nor emended to *yhvh*) *ki lekha yhvh hochalti ʾattah thaʿaneh ʾadhonāi ʾelohai,* "But for thee, O Yahweh, do I wait; it is thou, O Adonai my God, who wilt answer"; 130:1f., *mimmaʿamaqqim qeraʾthikha yhvh ʾadhonāi shimʿah bheqoli,* "Out of the depths I cry to thee, O Yahweh! O Adonai, hear my voice!" 130:3, *ʾim ʿavonoth tishmor yah ʾadhonāi mi yaʿamodh,* "If thou, O Yah, shouldst mark iniquities, Adonai, who could stand?"

It is obvious that the *ʾadhonāi* that appears in these passages is genuine because its presence is necessitated by the *parallelismus membrorum.* But it should also be equally as evident that in at least most of these passages *ʾadhonāi* does not mean "my Lord," but "the Lord of all." Thus, in these passages we have a fairly early confirmation for our conclusion drawn from Ex. 15:17 that *ʾadhonāi* = "the Lord of all," because the passages from the prophetic books go back into the eighth century B.C., and those from the Psalms, at least in part, can be contemporary with these prophetic passages or even older.

6. *Time of Origin.* Dalman and Baudissin admit that the ending of *ʾadhonāi,* which in their opinion originally meant "my Lord," gradually lost its function as a pronominal suffix. Only, as we have seen, they date the change from *ʾadhoni* and *ʾadhonai* to *ʾadhonāi,* and consequently the transition from "my Lord" to "the Lord of all," very late, as a matter of fact in the period after the OT books were already completed, when later "scribes" or "Massoretes" could undertake only minor alterations, as the correction from *ʾadhoni* or *ʾadhonai* to *ʾadhonāi.* But actually the *-āi* of *ʾadhonāi* was never a pronominal suffix. Rather, from the very beginning it was a nominal afformative, which elevated the basic form *ʾadhon* to a *status emphaticus* and gave *ʾadhonāi* the meaning "the Lord of all." Thus, no insurmountable obstacle stands in the way of assuming that *ʾadhonāi* is as old as Israel's adoption of the Yahweh cult. Now as far as subject matter is concerned, Yahweh's command to the people of Israel to worship no other god, and the reason given for this, viz., that Yahweh is a jealous God, are completely conceivable in the time of Moses. Furthermore, *ʾadhonāi,* "the Lord of all," may have been used first toward the end of the thirteenth century B.C. when the sanctuary at Shiloh was of very great cultic and religious significance and the designation of Yahweh (perhaps meaning the same thing as *ʾadhonāi*) as *yhvh tsebhaʾoth yoshebh ʿal hakkerubhim,* "Yahweh Sebaoth (→צבאות *tsᵉbhāʾôth*), who is enthroned on the cherubim," was first coined there. Or, it may have originated with the appearance of Elijah three or four centuries later, when, according to 1 K. 18:21, this prophet gave Israel the alternative: "If Yahweh is God, follow him; but if Baal, then follow him," and thus again demanded of his people conduct corresponding to the conception of Yahweh as "Lord of all." Just as many literary prophets beginning with Amos emphasized that Yahweh was "the Lord of all" in their preaching in the name of Yahweh, so also earlier cultic reforms could have called people back to Adonai.

7. *Summary.* The attempt to give a brief history of the use of the divine name Adonai would look something like this: The Song of Moses, Ex. 15:1-19, and

Material com direitos autorais

other examples attest to the usage of Adonai in the first half of the tenth century B.C. or earlier. The next time *ʾadhonāi* appears in passages which can be dated with certainty is in the last third of the eighth century B.C. in parallelism with Yahweh in Isa. 3:1 and Mic. 1:2 as well as in the Psalms mentioned above, which at least partly are contemporary with Isaiah and Micah or earlier. Some of the writing prophets use Adonai frequently, especially in introductions to divine oracles, as "Thus says Adonai Yahweh" (Am. 3:11, *koh ʾamar ʾadhonāi yhvh*), or in concluding formulas of divine oracles, as Isa. 3:15, "says Adonai Yahweh Sebaoth" *(neʾum ʾadhonāi yhvh tsebhaʾoth)*. It is worthy of note that this Adonai is often accompanied by expressions like "Sebaoth," which further emphasize in particular the excelling majesty of this Lord of all and stress it in this way. Furthermore, it should be pointed out that Amos, Isaiah, and Ezekiel, whose preaching particularly emphasizes the majestic exaltation of their God, use Adonai in conjunction with such expressions depicting his omnipotence more often than other prophets.

Notwithstanding the vast difference in the number of occurrences of Yahweh and Adonai in the OT as it now stands (over 6700 occurrences of Yahweh, and approximately 450 of Adonai), up until *ca.* 300 B.C. the divine names of Yahweh and Adonai, at least to a great extent, were on equal footing and appear side by side. But beginning *ca.* 300, Adonai gradually came to be used more than Yahweh until finally it completely displaced it, in any case in spoken language. The consonants of the Tetragrammaton יהוה came to be pronounced *ʾadhonāi,* or if *yhvh* was preceded by *ʾadhonāi,* it was pronounced *ʾelohim,* and in the Massoretic Text it is written יְהוָה or יֱהוִה. In this period, the book of Chronicles often replaces the *yhvh* of the book of Kings, which was its earlier model, by *ʾelohim,* and a similar change takes place in Pss. 42–87. The book of Esther contains no divine name, but refers to God indirectly in 4:14 as "another quarter" *(maqom ʾacher).* Ecclesiastes uses *ʾelohim* exclusively, while the book of Daniel (apart from *ʾadhonāi* in 1:2 and several occurrences of *yhvh* and *ʾadhonāi* in chap. 9, which for the most part is spurious) uses only *ʾelohim* and its Aramaic counterpart *ʾelahaʾ*. According to Dalman, the suppression of the name Yahweh began *ca.* 300 B.C., and the change from *yhvh* to *ʾadhonāi* or *ʾelohim* was complete by the second century B.C., while Baudissin thinks that the grandson of Jesus ben Sira, *ca.* 132 B.C., did not yet know of the replacement of Yahweh by Adonai. If, as we have tried to show above, the use of the divine name Adonai *(ʾadhonāi)* for Yahweh is very old, since there is evidence for its existence with this sense at least as early as the tenth century B.C., then the much discussed question whether the *kýriós (mou)* of the LXX translators indicates an original Adonai *(ʾadhonāi)* or represents the prototype for audibly speaking the Tetragrammaton *yhvh* by Adonai with the meaning Yahweh, may be partially resolved by noting that the choice of *kýrios* may also have been encouraged and facilitated by the fact that in Hellenism in general and in Oriental Hellenism in particular *kýrios* was a widespread designation for deities. It is certain that Dominus, Lord, Seigneur, Herr, and other similar names of the God of the Bible are directly or indirectly dependent on Adonai. Therefore, there is no justification whatsoever for the idea that the occurrences of *ʾadhonāi* or of the plural suffix *-āi* attached to *ʾadhon* did

The adjective *ʾaddir* is not connected with any particular sphere. The water of the Red Sea in which the Egyptians perished is *ʾaddir*, "mighty" (Ex. 15:10); the same is true of the sea with its waves which is subdued by the king Yahweh (Ps. 93:4). Both of these passages allude to the power of the chaos sea. Similar associations are suggested by Isa. 33:21 (the great ships which sail the sea). In other passages, the idea of splendor and glory is prevalent in this word, as when a great cedar is called *ʾaddir* (Ezk. 17:23; cf. also Zec. 11:2 of glorious trees). Ezk. 32:18 seems to use *ʾaddirim* with reference to "nations," if one follows the Massoretic vocalization; the powerful nations must go into the nether world.

But power and splendor also belong to men who have gained a certain position. Thus, e.g., the kings slain by Yahweh are said to be *ʾaddirim*, "famous" (Ps. 136:18), and "their mighty one" (*ʾaddir*) in Jer. 30:21 is a designation for the coming savior king (used in parallelism with *moshel*, "ruler"). Further, princes or nobles are designated as *ʾaddir*, Jer. 14:3; 25:34ff.; cf. Jgs. 5:13,25; Nah. 2:6 (Eng. v. 5); Neh. 3:5; 10:30(29); 2 Ch. 23:20. In this connection *ʾaddir* may stand in parallelism with *gibbor*, "hero" (Jgs. 5:13).

But power and splendor are primarily characteristics of the gods. Thus *ʾaddir* also occurs primarily with reference to God. Ps. 16:3 refers to the "holy ones"; but it is disputed whether this refers to human nature. If it refers to deities (other than Yahweh), then the text must be emended so that the psalmist has not "delight," but "no delight" in them. But since *qadhosh*, "holy," is usually connected with God, this interpretation is very probable.[6] Furthermore, *ʾaddir* appears as an attribute in 1 S. 4:8, where the Philistines cry out in fear: "Who can deliver us from the power of these mighty gods (*ʾelohim ʾaddirim*)?" According to the polytheistic understanding of the Philistines, the plural form expresses the "unknown" in the terrifying divine world of Israel. Yahweh is the mighty one (*ʾaddir*), mightier than "the mountains of prey" (Ps. 76:5[4]),[7] or mightier than the powerful waves of the sea (93:4). He can subdue the life-threatening might of the sea with his breath (Ex. 15:10). Here *ʾaddir* is closely connected with creation and deliverance (the chaos sea). Similar motifs appear in Isa. 33:21, where the saving power of Yahweh is compared with broad streams. Furthermore, Yahweh is the powerful one (*ʾaddir*), who cuts down the forests of Lebanon (10:34). What is true of Yahweh is also true of his name, which according to Ps. 8:2,10(1,9) is majestic in all the earth, which again in context refers to his creative power.

Usually, then, *ʾaddir* appears in contexts having to do with Yahweh's cosmological or other superhuman acts. This explains the secondary meaning "splendid, brilliant" (in parallelism with *naʾor*, "glorious," Ps. 76:5[4]).

Ahlström

---

6 See the comms.
7 See the comms.

Material com direitos autorais

אָדָם *ʾādhām*

Contents: I. Meaning, The Ancient Near East, Etymology. II. Usage in the OT. III. Anthropological and Theological Considerations.

I. Meaning, The Ancient Near East, Etymology.

1. *ʾadham,* meaning "man" or the proper name "Adam" (Gen. 4:25; 5:1-5; 1 Ch. 1:1),[1] usually appears in prose texts with the article, and in poetic texts without the article.[2] Predominantly, this word occurs as a collective singular designating a class (as "man" in English),[3] and therefore can be translated by "mankind" or as a plural "men." At the same time, it is often used of individuals (e.g., in passages using "blessed" like Ps. 32:2, or in Ezk. 27:13; Prov. 28:17; Eccl. 5:18 [Eng. v. 19]), and functions adjectivally ("human") or indefinitely ("someone"),[4] but never appears in the plural or in the construct.

2. This word does not occur in Akkadian with the meaning "man, mankind," but the Akkadian words *adamātu,* "dark, red soil," and *adamu,* "red blood" (cf. Heb. *dam,* postbiblical *ʾadham*) or "red garment," seem to be equivalent to Heb. *ʾadhamah* and *ʾadhom.*[5] The Akkadian word corresponding to Heb. *ʾadham*

ʾādhām. On "Man" in the OT: M. Bič, "The Theology of the Biblical Creation Epic," *SEÅ,* 28-29 (1963/64), 9-38; N. P. Bratsiotis, "נפשׁ-ψυχή, ein Beitrag zur Erforschung der Sprache und Theologie der Septuaginta," *SVT,* 15 (1966), 58-89; *idem,* Ἀνθρωπολογία τῆς Παλ. Διαθήκης, I (Athens, 1967); J. S. Croatto, *Revista Bíblica* (Argentina), 25 (1963), 29-30; W. Eichrodt, *Das Menschenverständnis des AT. AThANT,* 4 (1947); J. de Fraine, *Adam und seine Nachkommen* (1962); K. Galling, *Das Bild vom Menschen in biblischer Sicht* (1947); A. Gelin, *L'homme selon la Bible* (Paris, 1962; London, 1968); H. Goeke, *Das Menschenbild der individuellen Klagelieder. Ein Beitrag zur alttestamentlichen Anthropologie* (diss., Bonn, 1970); F. C. Grant, "Psychological Study of the Bible," *SNumen,* 14 (1968), 107-124; J. Hempel, *Gott und Mensch im AT. BWANT,* 3/2 (1926, ²1936); *idem, Das Ethos des AT* (²1964); A. R. Johnson, *The Vitality of the Individual in the Thought of Ancient Israel* (Cardiff, ²1964); C. Keller, "Leib, Seele, Geist: eine Skizze der bibl. Psychologie," *Beiträge zur Psychiatrie und Seelsorge,* 9 (1968), 2-7; L. Köhler, *Hebrew Man* (trans. 1956); H. Lamparter, *Das biblische Menschenbild* (1956); C. Lattey, "Vicarious Solidarity in the OT," *VT,* 1 (1951), 267-274; O. Loretz, *Die Gottebenbildlichkeit des Menschen* (1967), Appendix: E. Hornung, "Der Mensch als 'Bild Gottes' in Ägypten," 123-156; O. Loretz, *Schöpfung und Mythos* . . . (1968); E. Lussier, "Adam in Gen 1,1–4,24," *CBQ,* 18 (1956), 137-39; H.-P. Müller, "Mann und Frau im Wandel der Wirklichkeitserfahrung Israels," *ZRGG,* 17 (1965), 1-19; H. van Oyen, *Ethik des ATs* (1967); Pedersen, *ILC;* N. Perrin, "The Son of

(continued on p. 76)

[1] *GK,* § 125f.
[2] *GK,* § 126h.
[3] *GK,* § 126m.
[4] *GK,* § 139d.
[5] *CAD,* I/1, 94f.; *AHw,* 10.

Material com direitos autorais

is *awīlum* or *amī(ē)lu,* which also occurs in Hittite (alongside Hitt. *antuḫša*) as a foreign word.[6] In Akkadian the word designates the individual man as the representative of the class (alongside *awīlūtum, amī(ē)lūtu,* "mankind"), man in contrast to deities and animals, the citizen or resident of a region, the king ("man of Eshnunna," particularly in Mari) as well as the slave (particularly in Nuzi). A shift in meaning from "nobleman" to "full citizen" to "man," even "slave," can be ascertained.[7] The indefinite is used more often in Akkadian than it is in Biblical Hebrew.[8] The ancient poetic word for "man," *ṣalmāt qaqqadi,* "black-headed," is used almost exclusively as a designation for the natives of a land.[9]

The Akkadian traditions about the origin of man are not entirely uniform. The most widespread version says that man was created from the blood of a slain god.[10] According to the Old Babylonian myth of Atraḫasīs, the blood of a god "who has understanding" is mixed with clay.[11] It is remarkable that there is hardly any reference elsewhere in Akkadian literature to this half-divine origin of man.[12] Other statements mention only the creation out of clay.[13] Life or breath *(šāru)* is given by the gods.[14]

Man in Ancient Judaism and Primitive Christianity," *BiblRes,* 11 (1966), 17-28; G. Pidoux, *L'homme dans l'AT* (Neuchâtel, Paris, 1953); J. R. Porter, "The Legal Aspects of the Concept of 'Corporate Personality' in the OT," *VT,* 15 (1965), 361-380; H. W. Robinson, "The Hebrew Conception of Corporate Personality," *BZAW,* 66 (1936), 49-62; A. Safran, "La conception juive de l'homme," *RTP,* 98 (1964), 193-207; O. Sander, "Leib-Seele-Dualismus im AT?" *ZAW,* 77 (1965), 329-332; J. Scharbert, *Solidarität in Segen und Fluch im AT und in seiner Umwelt. BBB,* 14 (1958); W. Schmidt, "Anthropologische Begriffe im AT," *EvTh,* 24 (1964), 374-388; *idem,* "Gott und Mensch in Psalm 130," *ThZ,* 22 (1966), 241-253; *idem,* "Gott und Mensch in Psalm 8," *ThZ,* 25 (1969), 1-15; F. J. Stendebach, *Theologische Anthropologie des Jahwisten* (diss., Bonn, 1970); F. Stier, "Adam," *Hdb. theol. Grundbegriffe,* ed. H. Fries, I (1962), 13-25; F. Vattioni, "L'albero della vita," *Aug,* 7 (1967), 133-144; L. Wächter, *Der Tod im AT* (1967); *idem,* "Erfüllung des Lebens nach dem AT," *ZZ,* 22 (1968), 284-292; G. Whitfield, *God and Man in the OT* (London, 1949); H. Wildberger, "Das Abbild Gottes, Gen 1,26-30," *ThZ,* 21 (1965), 245-259, 481-501; W. Zimmerli, *Das Menschenbild des AT* (1949); *idem, Was ist der Mensch? Gött. Univ. reden,* 44 (1964); *idem,* "Der Mensch und seine Hoffnung nach den Aussagen des AT," *Studia Biblica et Semitica. Festschrift für Th. C. Vriezen* (1966), 389-403; *idem, Man and His Hope in the OT* (trans. 1971).

On Sections I.2-4: F. M. Th. de Liagre Böhl, "Das Menschenbild in babylonischer Schau," *SNumen,* 2 (1955), 28-48; P. Dhorme, *La religion assyro-babylonienne* (Paris, 1910), 180-206; S. Morenz, *Egyptian Religion* (trans. 1973), 47-49, 183; *idem, Gott und Mensch im alten Ägypten* (1964); E. Otto, *Gott und Mensch. AHAW,* 1 (1964); J. Sainte-Fare Garnot, "L'anthropologie de l'Egypte ancienne," *SNumen,* 2 (1955), 14-27.

For special literature on man's being made in the image of God, see nn. 60-68.

6 *J. Friedrich, Hethitisches Elementarbuch* (1940ff., [2]1960ff.), II, 82, 112.
7 Böhl, 29f.
8 *CAD,* I/2, 48-62; *AHw,* 90f.
9 *CAD,* 16, 75f.
10 Of Lamga, *KAR,* 4=*AOT,* 135; of "the rebel" Kingu in EnEl VI, 10-27.
11 Lambert-Millard, *Atra-ḫasīs* (1969), 56ff.
12 Böhl, 34f.
13 E.g., the so-called Theodicy, § 26, *AOT,* 291.
14 Dhorme, 186f.

Material com direitos autorais

were generated from the tears of the creator-god, which clearly is based on a wordplay on *rmṯ,* "man," and *rmy.t,* "tears." Thus, since people were generated before the procreation of the gods, they are also mentioned before them in lists. [29] However, a First Man or Primal Man is unknown in Egyptian literature. There is no place for another "First" beside the Primal (First) God as creator (→ אחד *'echādh*).

Man is a compound that cannot exist without the body; therefore, one tries to preserve the body by embalming. People have the "soul" elements Ka, Ba, and Ach in common with the gods. In this regard there is no fundamental difference between gods and men; the gods are simply more powerful. [30] In Merikare, 132, it even says that people "came forth from his (the god's) limbs." [31]

Both gods and men are subject to the highest god. Er (Re, Amun) gives them light (→ אור *'ôr)* and life; he is concerned for people, who are designated as "cattle of God," i.e., provided for by the divine herdsman, in the well-known passage in Merikare, 130f. [32] Heaven and earth along with everything that lives have been made for people. On the other hand, we read in Amenemope, 18, "God is in his excellence, man in his imperfection"; man "does not know how things will be on the morrow." [33] Proper names emphasize the help of the gods or designate the person wearing the name as "man" of the god, i.e., belonging to him. In the eighteenth dynasty there is even a reference to a "brother of (the goddess) Mut." [34]

5. Etymologically, *'adham* cannot be explained with certainty. F. Delitzsch thought it came from a Semitic root *adāmu,* "to build," to which he traced *admānu,* "building," and *admu,* "child"; [35] but according to contemporary scholars these words should be read *watmānu* and *watmu.* Dillmann enumerates a number of other early attempts to explain the origin of this word. [36] Sayce tried to trace *'adham* back to *Adapa,* [37] and Nöldeke to Arab. *'anām.* [38] Walker cites the Sum. *addamu* and translates "father of man," "father of mankind"; [39] however, the word for "my father" is *a-a-mu.* H. Bauer assumes that the original meaning was "skin." [40] The connection of *'adham* with *'adhom,* "to be red," seems plausible; this has been suggested by C. Brockelmann [41] and J. Pedersen ("... the normal human color which is prominent after washing, thus reddish-

---

29 So already in Pyr. 1466 b/d, "before heaven, earth, men, gods were generated"; cf. S. Sauneron - J. Yoyotte, *Naissance du monde* (Paris, 1959), 74f.

30 Sainte-Fare Garnot, 24.

31 *AOT,* 35.

32 *AOT,* 35.

33 *AOT,* 43f.

34 Sainte-Fare Garnot, 24.

35 F. Delitzsch, *Prolegomena eines neuen hebr.-aram. Wörterbuchs zum AT* (1886), 103f.

36 A. Dillmann, *Genesis* (⁶1892), 53f.

37 A. H. Sayce, *ExpT,* 17 (1906), 416f.; but cf. above, I.2.

38 *ZDMG,* 40 (1886), 722.

39 *ZAW,* 74 (1962), 66-68.

40 *ZA,* 28 (1913), 310f.

41 *Synt.,* § 11.

Copyrighted material

Josh. 11:14); in the polemic against foreign cults, whose gods are the work of men's hands (Dt. 4:28; cf. 2 K. 19:18; Isa. 37:19); and in passages that deal with the removal of human bones (1 K. 13:2; 2 K. 23:14,20).

ha'adham in Dt. 20:19 ("for the men are the trees of the field") is problematic; in any event an interrogative *he* has been misread as an article (see the LXX and Syriac), so that what is affirmed in the present text was originally meant to be negated.

4. The non-Deuteronomistic portions of the Historical Books Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings, contain no statements that are important for a theological understanding of *'adham*. Arba was the greatest man among the Anakim (Josh. 14:15); after the loss of his hair Samson becomes weak like all other men or like anyone else (Jgs. 16:7,11,17; cf. 1 S. 25:29); the inhabitants of Laish had no dealings with men (Jgs. 18:7,28; perhaps *'adham* should here be emended to *'aram*, "the Arameans"; see the LXX I and Syriac). David does not want to fall into the hand of man (2 S. 24:14), and Solomon was wiser than all men (1 K. 5:11[4:31]). "Human strokes" are threatened in 2 S. 7:14; the intrigues and rumors of men are denounced in 1 S. 24:10(9) and 26:19.

"Heart (courage) of man" (1 S. 17:32) and the scarcely intelligible *torath ha'adham*, "human instruction" (2 S. 7:19), should probably be emended.[44]

5. In Isa. 1–39 the word *'adham* occurs 17 times. In 31:3 the difference between God and man is stated quite clearly: "the Egyptians are men, and not God; and their horses are flesh, and not spirit"; in the same pericope it is predicted that Assyria will fall by a "non-man," *lo'-'adham* (31:8). In the other passages threats are predominant: the humiliation of man on the day of Yahweh (2:9,11,17,20,22; 5:15; cf. 13:12; 17:7) and the desertion of the land by man (6:11f.); only the "poor among men" shall exult (29:19). In his prayer, Hezekiah laments that in the underworld he will look upon man no more (38:11).

6. *'adham* occurs ten times in Deutero-Isaiah, three times in the polemic against idolatry in 44:11-15. The creation motif is taken up in 45:12. Israel is not to be afraid of mortal man (51:12); the *'ebhedh* is more unattractive than other men (52:14). 56:2 praises the man who keeps the Sabbath and does no evil, and 58:6 demands the self-humbling of man as true fasting.

The text and meaning of 43:4 ("I give men in return for you . . . ," perhaps to be emended to *'adhamoth;* Volz reads *'alaphim*) and 47:3 (to be emended to *'amar?*)[45] are uncertain.

7. Jeremiah's assessment of man is concentrated in the wisdom saying in 17:5 ("Cursed is the man who trusts in man . . . ")[46] and in the prayer in 10:23 ("the way of man is not in himself . . . ").[47]

---

[44] See H. W. Hertzberg, *I & II Samuel. OTL* (trans. 1964), 144 and 282, on these two passages.
[45] See Volz, *KAT*, IX, 36, 82.
[46] On the genuineness of this passage, see Rudolph, *HAT*, 12 (³1968), 115.
[47] *Ibid.*, 77.

Материјал заштићен ауторским правима

In Jeremiah *'adham* occurs 29 times in all. Nine times (usually in threats) it is coupled with → בהמה *bᵉhēmāh,* "beast" (7:20; 21:6; 27:5; 31:27; 33:10,12; 36:29; 50:3; 51:62); seven times it is used in oracles concerning regions deserted by men (2:6; 4:25; 32:43; 49:18,33; 50:40; 51:43; of filling Babylon with men: 51:14); three times of making idols (10:14; 16:20; 51:17); twice of the dead bodies of men which will fill the land (9:21[22]; 33:5); and twice in oracles concerning other disastrous fates of men (47:2; 49:15). According to the general scholarly opinion, the statements concerning a man's responsibility for his own sins (31:30) and the Deuteronomistic phrases in 32:19f. are not from Jeremiah himself.

8. The book of Ezekiel contains approximately one fourth of all the occurrences of *'adham* in the OT. The prophet, as representative of the creature, is addressed by *ben 'adham,* "son of man," 93 times: this is correct Hebrew and is not to be explained by linguistic usage in Babylonian or Aramaic.[48] The affinity with H appears in 20:11,13,21: by the observance of Yahweh's ordinances man shall live (cf. Lev. 18:5). The difference between man and God is emphasized in the poem concerning Tyre (28:2,9–*'adham* in 34:31 is probably a later addition).[49] Mostly eschatological texts announce that men will fill the land (23:42; 36:10,11,12,37,38; cf. 31:14) or that the land will be deserted by men (29:11; 32:13). The vision which Ezekiel saw at his call describes animals in the form of men (1:5,26) with human hands (1:8; cf. 10:8,21) and human faces (1:10; cf. 10:14; 41:19); 19:3,6 speak of man-eating lions (cf. 36:13f.), and 4:12,15 of human dung. Slaves who are sold are called *nephesh 'adham* (27:13), dead bodies, *'etsem 'adham* (39:15), and corpses, *meth 'adham* (44:25). The expression *'adham ubhehemah,* "man and beast," is used seven times, usually in threats of destruction (14:13,17,19,21; 25:13; 29:8; 36:11; cf. 38:20).

9. *'adham* occurs in the Minor Prophets 28 times. In Amos it occurs only in the doxology in 4:13: "...who declares to man what is his thought."[50]

In Hosea, the problematic *ke-'adham* in 6:7 is usually interpreted today as a place name;[51] however, the meanings "like man" or "like Adam" are not excluded. 13:2 (against idolatry) is also disputed.[52] 9:12 (childlessness) and 11:4 ("human cords" or "leather cords") are connected with the Exodus tradition.

Mic. 6:8 states the duty of all mankind. *'adham* also occurs in the following passages in Micah: 2:12; 5:6(7) (future abundance of men); 5:4(5) (fighters against Assyria); and 7:2 (none upright among men).

Habakkuk laments the human misery caused by the Chaldeans (subjugation, bloodshed–1:14; 2:8,17). In Zephaniah *'adham* appears in threats (1:3,17); in Joel in a call to lament (1:12); in Jonah it occurs in the description of the repentance of men and animals (3:7,8) and in the conclusion concerning the great

---

48 Zimmerli, *BK,* XIII, 70f. → בן *bēn.*
49 *Ibid.,* 832.
50 (?) See H. W. Wolff, *BK,* XIV/2, 249, 254-56, 264.
51 Wolff, *Hosea* (trans. 1974), 105, 121; Rudolph, *KAT,* XIII, 141f.
52 Wolff, *Hosea,* 219, 225; Rudolph, 237f., 242.

Материјал заштићен ауторским правима

and concerning the wicked in 6:12; 11:7; 15:20; 17:18; 19:3; 20:25; 21:16, 20; 24:30; 27:20; 28:17; 29:23,25). The reputation one has with his fellow men is important (3:4). Proverbs never speaks of Israel or the Israelites. But man's relationship to God is emphasized in this book: man plans his way, but Yahweh controls destiny, which is often incomprehensible to man, and requites him according to his work (12:14; 16:1,9; 20:24,27; 24:12).[57] *ʾadham* occurs three times in makarisms ("Blessed are") (3:13; 8:34; 28:14), twice in the verdict *kesil ʾadham,* "foolish man" (15:20; 21:20; see Gen. 16:12).

13. In the 49 occurrences of *ʾadham* (among which *bene ʾadham,* "sons of men," occurs 10 times) in Ecclesiastes, the author declares especially the total dependence of man[58]: his fate is determined in advance, he has no opportunity to dispute about it (6:10; 3:19). Diligence and prudence are commendable, but cannot guarantee success and therefore are vanity (1:3; 2:21f.; 6:11; 10:14). Death is the end of everything (7:2,14; 12:5). Life is beyond man's comprehension (3:11; 6:12; 8:17; 9:1,12) and laborious (1:13; 6:7; 8:6; 9:12); the heart of man is full of evil (9:3; cf. 8:9,11). And yet man should enjoy life and delight in everything which God has given (3:13,22; 11:8). The "end" of the whole is: it is proper for each man to fear God and keep his commandments (12:13).

14. In the book of Daniel (where *ʾadham* occurs 4 times), the angel having the appearance of a man (10:16,18), who speaks to the seer with a man's voice (8:16), addresses him as *ben ʾadham,* "son of man" (8:17); see under → אנוש *ʾenôsh.*

15. *ʾadham* occurs twice in Lamentations: God regards the cause of the oppressed (3:36, where *ʾadham* is in parallelism with *gebher*); his constant sigh is unjustified (3:39).

16. Nehemiah uses *ʾadham* three times as an indefinite (2:10,12; 9:29). In the books of Chronicles (where *ʾadham* appears 10 times), 1 Ch. 29:1 and 2 Ch. 19:6 direct attention away from man to God. 2 Ch. 6:18 contains the words *ʾeth haʾadham,* "with man" ("will God dwell indeed with man on the earth?"), which are missing in the parallel passage in 1 K. 8:27. 1 Ch. 21:13 repeats 2 S. 24:14, and 2 Ch. 6:36,29,30 repeat 1 K. 8:46,38,39. In 1 Ch. 5:21, the *nephesh ʾadham,* "men alive," are captives. In 2 Ch. 32:19 the gods of the heathen are called the work of men's hands, and 1 Ch. 17:17 (like 2 S. 7:19) has an uncertain text (perhaps: "Thou hast been able to find me out better than men").[59]

III. Anthropological and Theological Considerations. The use of the word *ʾadham* in the OT presents one of the strongest evidences for ancient Israelite universalism. In most passages using *ʾadham,* including the earliest texts, it is

---

57 Cf. Ringgren, *ATD,* XVI/1, 10f.
58 Cf. Zimmerli, *ATD,* XVI/1, 134-142.
59 So Rudolph, *HAT,* 21 (1955), 130f.

Materiál chráněný autorskými právy

clear that this word is not intended to refer particularly to Israelites, but to all men. Taking into consideration the number of passages and the most important statements, the most prominent concern with regard to *ʾadham* in the OT is the relationship between God and man; and nowhere is there any reason to doubt that the OT author has the God of Israel in mind; but this is no indication of a particularistic narrowness: it is the Lord and Keeper of all men whom alone and exclusively Israel wishes to confess. Essentially, what the OT says about man is determined by an encounter with and a relationship to God. That this God speaks and acts like a person brings about the living response and action of man. That there is only one God, that he stands behind all events of life and destiny, leads to a constant confrontation between man and God, and prevents all excuses that could be used in the world of polytheism and natural religion. But this does not mean that the Israelite appraisal of man results from mystical speculation about the afterlife. Israel's testimony concerning man was gained from life's experiences and reason and was authenticated in life. Even that which the OT affirms objectively about God and his dealings with man is to be advanced and defined as a phenomenon of the human sphere. Even where mythical traditions about the surrounding world enter into the presentation, as in the prehistory of Genesis, they are made to serve the intention of the Israelite view of man.

The oft repeated assertions that the OT did not intend to give general teachings concerning man, and that the various OT statements about man are inconsistent and should not be placed on the same level, need to be examined and clarified. It is clear that the purpose of the Wisdom Literature is to give instruction concerning the potentialities and limitations of man. But also the Psalms, the Prophets, P, and Deuteronomy intend to give instruction and teaching concerning the true nature of man. When they give this instruction, they want to be understood to say that it was applicable to all men for all time. The OT ideas that the way of man is not in his own power, that he does not live by bread alone but by the word of God, that God requires love and humility, are not limited to a single situation or to a single moment in time. We must reject any suggestion that the witness of a believer in Yahweh would have been essentially different from this at another time and in another situation. The OT writings agree on fundamental ideas concerning man. Of course, it is axiomatic that the language of a literature which came into being during the course of a thousand years was subject to change and did not always remain constant. That the earliest and latest writings of the OT agree so much in their anthropology is unique in the history of ideas.

The following individual characteristics of the OT view of man are most prominent.

(a) Man has a unique position among created beings. The divine breath of life is breathed into him alone; the command and prohibition of God is given to him alone; he has to name the animals, i.e., he is their lord (Gen. 2). He almost has divine position; the earth with all its creatures is subject to him (Ps. 8). God created him in his image (→ צלם *tselem*), and gave him dominion (Gen. 1:26-28).

Materiál chráněný autorskými právy

(b) The OT recognizes man's total dependence with great clarity. Man is a creature of God composed of flesh, soul, and spirit (→ בשר *bāśār;* → נפש *nephesh;* → רוח *rûach*).[69] In contrast to man in our day, to the ancient Israelite it was a matter of astonishing reflection that he was brought into being through a mysterious embryonic process separate and apart from his own volition and help, and under conditions which were ordained by a Being wholly other than himself, in which he had no right to participate and against which he had no right of veto. The OT emphasizes throughout that life comes within the limits of birth and death. But man knows that he is dependent not only with regard to the basic structure of human existence, but also with regard to the possibilities which life offers and denies; he is weak and helpless. There is no guarantee that he can determine his own destiny or think that his life will be prosperous by his own efforts and accomplishments. Life has its own laws and an irreversible deterioration. For the believer, however, it is not a series of meaningless accidents, but a divinely determined sequence of events which are full of meaning.

(c) In the OT, man's awareness of his dependence is not to be separated from his consciousness of responsibility. The Creator has a claim on his creatures including or excluding any other claim. The affirmation that man is Yahweh's *ʿebhedh,* "servant," involves assuming complete responsibility before him, and not merely partial responsibility before tribe and people. It is true that the ancient Israelite regarded himself as a member of the whole group;[70] but this did not mean that he ceased to be conscious of his own individual personality. The statement, "one man is no man . . ."[71] must be rejected. We need to revise such statements as these which for all practical purposes deny the individualism that existed in ancient Israel, at least in the judicial realm.[72] The life of the individual is a test. God knows and judges each decision of man. For the Israelite, this examination is an essential part of life; in this understanding he arrives at the ultimate goal and fulfilment of life. He knows that he is under obligation to obey, and is prepared to submit to the judgment of the one who sees his thoughts and feelings from every angle and who can call him to give a complete account of his deeds. It is remarkable to see how the different OT texts dealing with this subject witness universally to this way of thinking and acting. The sources which come from the earliest period do not differ from the late legal writings here; the prophets, who denounce the sacrificial cult, are no different from the psalmists or the Chronicler, who lives within the cultic order; the Israelite Wisdom Literature is not at variance with the Apocalyptic.

(d) Man is "sinful"; he does not meet the total requirement but constantly fails. The passages using *ʾadham,* especially in J and D, are unmistakable on this point. Sin is of irrational power and depth. Thus, when man is said to be → צדיק *tsaddîq,*

---

69 Cf. esp. D. Lys, *Nephesh* (1959); *Ruach* (1962); *Bâsâr* (1967).
70 Cf. the works on the concept of "corporate personality," esp. J. de Fraine.
71 Köhler, *OTTheol,* 129.
72 See Porter.

Materiál chráněný autorskými právy

אֲדָמָה ʾadhāmāh

Contents: I. 1. Etymology; 2. Occurrences. II. Usages in the OT Text. *ʾadhamah* As: 1. A Substance; 2. Cultivated Land; 3. Property; 4. Dwelling Place. III. Specific Theological Considerations: 1. Cultic Aspects; 2. Theological-Anthropological Significance; 3. The Land of Israel.

I. 1. *Etymology.* *ʾadhamah* (Syr. *ʾadamtā,* Arab. *ʾadamat,* Nabatean *ʾadhmatah*) is derived from the root *ʾdm,* "to be red," which also appears in Ugar. *ʾdm,*[1] Arab. *ʾadima,* Ethiop. *ʾadma,* Akk. *adammu,* and Egyp. *idmy* ("red linen"),[2] so that *ʾadhamah* is said to mean "red, plowed land,"[3] "red earth,"[4] or "reddish gleaming cultivated land containing iron,"[5] depending on the impression that it makes on the eye.[6] Rocks also were "differentiated by color rather than material formation."[7] König suggested that *ʾadhamah* might be derived from Arab. *ʾádama,* iunxit, "he has joined," addidit, "he has added."[8] In this case, *ʾadhamah* would be a covering layer.[9] In the LXX it is translated almost always by *gē,* in the Targum by *ʾarʿā* and *ʾadhmᵉthā* (5 times), in the Syriac usually by *ʾarʿā,* but also by *ʾatrā,* "place," and by *ʾadamtā* and *qeṭmā,* "ashes."[10]

ʾadhāmāh. A. Amsler, "Adam le terreux dans Genèse 2-4," *RTP,* 38 (1958), 107-112; Dalman, *AuS,* II; A. Dietrich, *Mutter Erde* (³1925); R. Gradwohl, *Die Farben im AT. Eine terminologische Studie. BZAW,* 83 (1963); A. de Guglielmo, "The Fertility of the Land in the Messianic Prophecies," *CBQ,* 19 (1957), 306-311; J. Kelso, *The Ceramic Vocabulary of the OT* (New Haven, 1948); A. Lefèvre, "Genèse 2,4b-3,24 est-il composite?" *RScR,* 36 (1949), 465-480; J. G. Plöger, *Literarkritische, formgeschichtliche und stilkritische Untersuchungen zum Deuteronomium. BBB,* 26 (1967), 60-129; G. von Rad, "Verheissenes Land und Jahwes Land im Hexateuch," *ZDPV,* 66 (1943), 191-204; repr. *ThB,* 8 (²1961), 87-100; L. Rost, "Die Bezeichnungen für Land und Volk im AT," *Festschrift O. Procksch* (1934), 125-148; repr. *Das kleine Credo und andere Studien zum AT* (1965), 76-101; A. W. Schwarzenbach, *Die geographische Terminologie im Hebräischen des AT* (Leiden, 1954); H. Wildberger, "Israel und sein Land," *EvTh,* 16 (1956), 404-422.

1 ? thus *WUS,* Gordon, Driver.

2 The possible etymological origin of *dam,* "blood," in this root cannot be demonstrated with certainty; Gradwohl, 4f.

3 *KBL*³, 15.

4 Schwarzenbach, 133.

5 Galling, *BRL,* 151; Levy, *WTM,* I, 29.

6 *AuS,* I, 233; II, 26-28.

7 Philby, *Heart of Arabia,* I (1922), 26; cf. Josephus *Ant.* i.1.2; *ʾodhem,* "ruby," Ex. 28:17; Ezk. 28:13.

8 E. König, *Hebräisches und aramäisches Wörterbuch zum AT* (1910), 5.

9 Similarly ("Haut") *BLe,* § 61n III.

10 Schwarzenbach, 136.

Copyrighted material

II. Usages in the OT Text. Beginning with its original meaning (I.1), *'adhamah* has taken on various nuances of meaning.

1. *'adhamah As a Substance.* (a) As a substance, *'adhamah* means reddish-brown *loose earth* (humus), which from time to time is dry, but is capable of absorbing water, as distinct from "stones" (*'abhanim,* Ex. 20:24f.; cf. 2 K. 3:19-25; Isa. 5:2) and conceptually from → עפר *'āphār,* "dust" (which occurs 108 times in the OT, of which it is in parallelism with *'adhamah* in Gen. 3:19; Job 5:6; cf. Isa. 29:4; Job 14:8).[14]

Like dust (Josh. 7:6; Ezk. 27:30; Lam. 2:10; cf. Job 2:12; 16:15) and ashes (2 S. 13:19; Est. 4:1), *'adhamah* was sprinkled on the head (1 S. 4:12; 2 S. 1:2; 15:32; Neh. 9:1) as a sign of mourning, self-abasement, and humility.[15] The original apotropaic (protection from demons by disfigurement) and magical (union with the lot of the dead) rite is adopted, preserved, and at the same time eliminated in traditional usage. It could remind the Israelite of his own nothingness (dust and ashes! Gen. 2:7; 3:19; 18:27; Sir. 10:9; Isa. 26:19; Job 20:11; 21:26; Ps. 22:30[29]), and be a sign of humble submission to divine providence.[16]

(b) Without distinguishing it in meaning from clay as a raw material (cf. Isa. 30:14; Ps. 22:16[15]; Prov. 26:23; Job 2:8; 41:22[30]), *'adhamah* as dry soil[17] is used in the manufacture of earthen vessels (Isa. 45:9) and as molds in the manufacture of metals (1 K. 7:46; 2 Ch. 4:17).[18]

(c) The *'adhamah* forms a cohesive, durable surface area. From it the snare springs up (Am. 3:5), upon it stand the waters of the flood (Gen. 8:8,13). It opens its mouth (Gen. 4:11; Nu. 16:30) like a wild animal, "is split asunder" *(baqaʿ),* "swallows" (→ בלע *bālaʿ*) the company of Korah, and closes over them again (Nu. 16:30-34; par. *'erets*).

The blood of the innocent who is slain cries out from the ground (Gen. 4:10) until it is covered with dirt (Gen. 37:26; Isa. 26:21; Ezk. 24:7f.; Job 16:18), or until the vengeance is executed.[19]

(d) On *'adhamah* as matter in the creation, see III.2.

2. *'adhamah As Cultivated Land.* (a) As productive humus, *'adhamah* is arable land that is to be cultivated by → אדם *'ādham,* "man" (→ עבד *ʿābhadh,* "to till," Gen. 2:5; 3:23; 4:2,12; 9:20; 47:23; 2 S. 9:10; Zec. 13:5; 1 Ch. 27:26), and

---

14 Essentially *ʿaphar* is often the same as *'adhamah,* G. Fohrer, *KAT,* XVI (1963), 319f.

15 E. Kutsch, "'Trauerbräuche' und 'Selbstminderungsriten' im AT," *ThSt,* 78 (1965), 25-42.

16 P. Heinisch, *Die Trauergebräuche bei den Israeliten. BZfr,* 13/7-8 (1931), esp. § 3, 33-39.

17 Kelso, § 2.

18 On Ex. 20:24, the altar made out of *'adhamah,* see III.1.c.

19 Cf. E. Merz, *Die Blutrache bei den Israeliten. BWAT,* 20 (1916), 50.

Material com direitos autorais

nally different strata of the Paradise narrative [43] pertaining to the way in which the weakness of man was depicted (Gen. 3:19; 18:27; Ps. 103:14; Job 30:19).

(b) Origin, life, and destiny connect the → אדם *ʾādhām*, "man," [44] with the *ʾadhamah*. However, the *ʾadhamah* is cursed because of the sin of man (Gen. 3:17-19), so that the original solidarity gives way to an alienation between man and the elementary basis of his existence. [45] According to the Yahwistic version, man's originally easy work for food is replaced by hard labor (cf. Gen. 2:7,15 with 3:23). The land lost its "original fertility." [46] Thorns and thistles impede the productivity of the land (3:18). After the toil of life, the *ʾadham* returns *(shubh)* to *ʾadhamah* out of which he was taken *(laqach),* for he is → עפר *ʿāphār* (3:19; Ps. 104:29; cf. Dnl. 12:2). The same fate also awaits the most powerful of men (Ps. 146:4; Eccl. 3:20).

(c) Gen. 4 describes a punishment even more severe than that imposed in 3:17-19. One who kills his own brother is banished from the ground, which opens its mouth to drink his brother's (→ אח *ʾāch*) blood (4:11f.). The *ʾadhamah* completely refuses to yield its strength to him (4:12). The growing wickedness of man (see 2:4b–3:24; 4:1-16,17-24; 6:1-4) leads to the decision of Yahweh (stated anthropopathically) to destroy everything which he created from the *ʾadhamah* except Noah (6:5-8). However, in the new period of salvation history, Yahweh, because of his compassion on man in his moral weakness, restricts his punitive holiness (8:21). The toil of work is relieved by Noah (5:29), because as an *ʾish haʾadhamah,* "man of the ground" (RSV, "tiller of the soil"), he is the first to plant a vineyard (9:20).

3. *The Land of Israel.* (a) Outside the Primitive History, the *ʾadhamah* motif is quite relevant for the Deuteronomistic conception of a pragmatic theological history connected with the tradition of Israel's election. Israel does not possess the *ʾadhamah* as a natural gift by virtue of a sequence of historical events. While other nations may boast of their permanent possession of land (Mesha Inscription, *KAI,* 181.10: "The people of Gad have lived in the land of Ataroth since the beginning of time"), Israel owes its land to Yahweh, whose guidance in salvation history reaches its climax in the gift of the land (Am. 2:10; 3:2). Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic history never tire of repeating this idea. [47] Before they were settled in Canaan, the clans and tribes of Israel had no land (Dt. 26:5); but Yahweh "swore" (→ נשבע *nishbaʿ*, Nu. 11:12; 32:11; Dt. 11:9,21; 28:11; 31:7) [48] to the fathers that he would give them the *ʾadhamah* as a place to live and as a basis for existence. At the time of the conquest, as the only possessor ("Yahweh's

---

[43] Gunkel, *GHK, I*/1, 6, 26; J. Begrich, *ThB,* 21 (1964), 19; W. Fuss, *Die sog. Paradieserzählung* (1968), 25; etc.

[44] Amsler, 108f.; E. Lussier, "Adam in Gen. 1,1-4,24," *CBQ,* 18 (1956), 137-39.

[45] G. von Rad, *Genesis. OTL* (trans. 1961), 91.

[46] Guglielmo, 308.

[47] On the Deuteronomistic redaction of Am. 2:10-12, see W. H. Schmidt, *ZAW,* 77 (1965), 178-183.

[48] Plöger, 63-79; N. Lohfink, *Die Landverheissung als Eid. SBS,* 28 (1967).

Матеріал, захищений авторським правом

land" occurs only in Isa. 14:2; cf. 2 Ch. 7:20; the obscure text in Dt. 32:43 suggests a similar interpretation; cf. Lev. 25:23) Yahweh "gives" (→ נתן *nāthan*– Ex. 20:12; Lev. 20:24; Dt. 11:9; 21:1; 26:15; 1 K. 9:7 = 2 Ch. 7:20; 1 K. 14:15; 2 K. 21:8; Jer. 24:10; 25:5; 35:15; Ezk. 28:25; cf. 2 Ch. 33:8) the land in guileless, free grace. Thus, Israel takes possession of it (→ ירש *yārash*, Lev. 20:23-25; Dt. 30:18; 31:13; 32:47) as its land (Dt. 7:13; 21:23) and as an inheritance (→ נחלה *nach^{a}lāh)* after the divinely effected expulsion of its inhabitants. The OT describes the conquest as a united effort of Yahweh and Israel: Yahweh brings Israel into the land (Dt. 31:20), and Israel goes over the Jordan (31:13; 32:47). There Israel is said to enjoy the blessings of the rich (Neh. 9:25) and good (Josh. 23:13,15; 1 K. 14:15) land, so that Dt. 31:20 can even speak of the *'adhamah* flowing with milk and honey.[49] Israel experiences Yahweh's faithfulness to a word which he gave under oath when they receive the land which he swore to their fathers (Josh. 21:45). The eschatological gift of salvation is actualized for each new generation by the proclamation in the cult and the family; cf. especially the prayer offered when the firstfruits are offered: "I declare *this day* to the Lord your God that *I* have come into the land."

(b) The land promise, which originally was given unconditionally, is understood conditionally in the theology of the Deuteronomistic history. The Deuteronomist had to interpret this promise in light of the fact that after it had been fulfilled temporarily, Yahweh's people lost the land when they were carried into exile. They kept Israel's hope alive in the integrity of this promise by maintaining from a historico-theological perspective that the land would be restored to God's people if they would return to him. The promise of the land and the gift of the land are inseparably related to obedience or disobedience to Yahweh's righteous will. Therefore, none who has not obeyed Yahweh completely during the march through the wilderness is allowed to see the land (Nu. 32:11). Although Yahweh intends to give the land to Israel "for ever" (*kol hayyamim,* Dt. 4:40; cf. Jer. 25:5), they can actually live a long and happy life on the *'adhamah* (*'arakh yamim,* Dt. 4:40; 5:16; 11:9; 25:15; 30:18,20; 32:47; *rabhah yamim,* 11:21) only if all of them ("even their children," 31:13) continually obey ("all the days that they live upon the *'adhamah,"* 4:10; 12:1; 31:13; similarly 12:19; cf. 1 K. 8:40; 2 Ch. 6:31) all the commandments (Lev. 26). In the parenetic expansions of Deuteronomy, the promise of the *'adhamah* appears specifically in the commandment concerning honoring one's parents (Ex. 20:12; Dt. 5:16) and in the law concerning just measures and weights (Dt. 25:13-16) as a motivation for complete obedience to Yahweh (see also 21:22f.; 26:1-11). The choosing of "life" means that God's people will continue to dwell in the land (30:20). In a specific historical situation, surrender to a foreign conqueror may mean that Israel will be allowed to stay in their native land, while rebellion against this conqueror may mean that they will lose their *'adhamah* (Jer. 27:10f.).

---

[49] In all other passages where this expression occurs, *'erets* alone is used; even some mss. of Dt. 31:20 have *'erets;* on this stereotyped formula with *'erets* and *'adhamah,* see Plöger, 124-26.

The many admonitions to keep the law and the urgent warnings against transgressing any form of it originate out of a concern to preserve the land as the greatest possession in salvation (which indicates that the hope of a resurrection was yet to be fully developed).

When the Israelites were unfaithful or disobedient, i.e., when they went after foreign gods, Yahweh reacted by destroying them from off the *'adhamah* (→ אבד *'ābhadh*, "perish," Josh. 23:13; → גלה *gālāh*, "remove, go into exile," 2 K. 17:23; 25:21; Jer. 52:27; Am. 7:11,17; *hishmidh*, "destroy," Dt. 6:15; Josh. 23:15; 1 K. 13:34; Am. 9:8; → כלה *kālāh*, "consume," Ex. 32:12; Dt. 28:21; → כרת *kārath*, "cut off," 1 K. 9:7; → נוד *nûdh*, "wander," 2 K. 21:8; *nasach*, "pluck off," Dt. 28:63; Sir. 48:15; *nathash*, "uproot," Dt. 29:27[28]; 1 K. 14:15; Jer. 12:14f.; 2 Ch. 7:20; → סור *sûr*, "remove," 2 Ch. 33:8; → תמם *tāmam*, "utterly destroy," Jer. 24:10).

The threats of calamity are fulfilled by devastating the land (Isa. 6:11; Joel 1:10) and by carrying a portion of the people into exile (Am. 7:11,17; Jer. 35:15-17), who are separated from the legitimate Yahweh cult because they have lost their native land and their property (Ps. 137:4).

Still, the land promise which was confirmed by an oath remains in effect and is fulfilled again in the New Exodus. Yahweh will "bring" his people "back" (*bo'* in the hiphil, Jer. 23:8; Ezk. 20:42; 34:13; 36:24; 37:12,21; cf. Jer. 16:15; 31:23-28) into the *'adhamah*, "place" them on their own land (*hinniach 'al*, Ezk. 37:14), plant them again on their land (Am. 9:15; cf. Jer. 24:6; 32:41; 42:10), and "gather" them into their own land (*kanas*, Ezk. 39:28; cf. Ps. 147:2). There they will dwell on their own land securely (Ezk. 28:25f.; 34:27; 39:26) and in paradisiacal abundance (Am. 9:13-15), and will receive a rich abundance of seed and fruit of the ground (Isa. 30:23-26; Dt. 30:9). Yahweh grants the penitent prayer of the people to return to the land (1 K. 8:34 = 2 Ch. 6:25). He gives them peace (Isa. 14:1, → ארץ *'erets*, *menuchah*) on the *'adhamah*, which they inherit as their portion "in the holy land" (Zec. 2:16[12]).

J. G. Plöger

Матеріал, захищений авторським правом

"to cling to someone" (4:6), *epithymētḗs eínai,* "to be eager for" (1:22), *zētéō,* "to seek" (Mic. 3:2), *eráō*, "to love" (Est. 2:17), *erōtís,* "passion" (Prov. 7:18 for *'ohabh*). It should be mentioned that *eráō* and *erōtís* were used only once apiece, as a translation of *'ahabhah* and *'ohabh*, and in a text that had to do with sexual love, which is the basic concept expressed by these words. Therefore, *agapáō* may be regarded as the classical equivalent to *'ahabh*, even though it is also used to translate Heb. *ratsah, richam,* and *chaphets.*[24]

3. *The Scope of the Concept of Love in the OT.* The scope of the concept *to love/love* in the OT idiom is very broad. It extends from the affection of members of the opposite sex for one other (Isaac and Rebekah, Gen. 24:67; Jacob and Rachel, 29:18,30; Leah and Jacob, 29:32; Shechem and Dinah, 34:3; Samson and one of the daughters of the Philistines, Jgs. 14:16; Samson and Delilah, 16:4,15; Elkanah and Hannah, 1. S. 1:5; Michal and David, 18:20; Amnon and Tamar, 2 S. 13:1,4) or even conjugal intercourse itself (Hos. 3:1); to the intimate bonds between father and (favorite) son (Gen. 22:2; 25:28; 37:3; 44:20; Prov. 13:24) or between mother and her favorite child (Gen. 25:28) or between daughter-in-law and mother-in-law (Ruth 4:15); to friendly relationships between men, like Saul and David (1 S. 16:21), Jonathan and David (18:1-3; 20:17; 2 S. 1:26), teacher and disciple (Prov. 9:8), servant and master (Ex. 21:5; Dt. 15:16); even to the intimate relationship between a people and their military leader (1 S. 18:16,22). Both love for one's fellow men as a kind, friendly, helpful attitude toward one's countrymen (Lev. 19:18) and the pouring out of one's heart to the stranger (19:34; Dt. 10:18,19) are to be understood in the latter sense. Pedersen correctly emphasizes the community-related character of the concept of love and friendship in the OT.[25]

But finally, the root *'ahabh* is also used for the relationship between Yahweh and Israel or his godly ones (Dt. 10:12; 11:13,22; 19:9; 30:6; Josh. 22:5; 23:11; Jer. 2:2), and thus indicates total love which demands all of one's energies. To some extent this attitude of man toward God is manifested in one's love for Jerusalem, Yahweh's sanctuary, Zion (Isa. 66:10; Lam. 1:2; Ps. 122:6), or for God's name (Ps. 5:12[11]; 69:37[36]; 119:132). But all this is based on Yahweh's love for Israel, which motivates him to punish and to save them (Hos. 11:4[9:15]; Jer. 31:3; Isa. 43:4; 63:9; Zeph. 3:17; Mal. 1:2; Dt. 7:8,13; 10:15; 23:6[5]; 2 Ch. 2:10[11]; 9:8).

However, this survey does not warrant any hasty conclusions concerning the specific character of the concept of love, since the different historical periods or especially the literary forms connected with the types of literature found in the OT characteristically have filled this root with stereotyped content, and accordingly are interested in entirely different aspects of the concept of love. Thus the narrative sources are more concerned with the relationship of men to each other, while the didactic socio-ethical interests of the Wisdom Literature see the same

---

[24] Quell, 20f., 21, n. 2.
[25] Pedersen, *ILC,* II, 309f., 341f., 353, 414. For further discussion, see below.

Материјал заштићен ауторским правима

love" (27:5). Cant. 8:6b perhaps also has in mind the way in which love expressed itself: "Love is strong as death." Love is not passive, but is active in the highest, most passionate degree.

Anyone who sets his heart on something wicked is naturally motivated to do wickedness: "Your chiefs are rebels and companions of thieves. Every one loves a bribe and runs after gifts. They do not defend the fatherless, and the widow's cause does not come to them" (Isa. 1:23f.). According to Trito-Isaiah, even non-Israelites who energetically follow Yahweh are to be preferred to such leaders, so e.g.: "And the foreigners who join themselves to Yahweh, to minister to him, to love the name of Yahweh, and to be his servants... and every one who holds fast my covenant" (56:6). Thus it is quite clear that one's love to Yahweh must be expressed in activity. The Israel that loves Yahweh follows him in obedience: "I remember the devotion of your youth, your love as a bride, how you followed me in the wilderness, in a land not sown" (Jer. 2:2). Similarly, the deeds Yahweh does in behalf of his people are to be explained out of his love for them: "I have loved you with an everlasting love; therefore I have continued my faithfulness (→ חסד *chesedh*) to you" (31:3; cf. Hos. 11:4). It was because of his love and compassion alone that Yahweh saved them, lifted them up, and sustained them in the past; and this is especially the theme of the Deuteronomic preaching: "It is because Yahweh loves you, and is keeping the oath which he swore to your fathers, that Yahweh has brought you out with a mighty hand, and redeemed you from the house of bondage, from the hand of Pharaoh king of Egypt" (Dt. 7:8). "Yet Yahweh set his heart in love upon your fathers and chose their descendants after them, you above all peoples, as at this day" (10:15).

An OT text can be speaking of love even when the word *'ahabh* is not actually used, but the attitude of love is clearly described or demanded in the context. The OT enjoins people to love their enemies in this sort of passage: "If your enemy is hungry, give him bread to eat; and if he is thirsty, give him water to drink" (Prov. 25:21). "If you meet your enemy's ox or his ass (which has) gone astray, you shall bring (it) back to him. If you see the ass of one who hates you lying under his burden, you shall refrain from leaving him with it, you shall help him to lift it up" (Ex. 23:4f.).

It is precisely in such deeds of love that the command to love can be seen in a proper perspective, viz., the attitude of love is itself made the norm. Therefore, love is not merely a demand which a humanitarian spirit makes on a man, but it is rooted in the divine command to love. At the same time, the feeling of love for God and the prayer, "I love Yahweh, because he has heard my fervent cries" (Ps. 116:1, emended text), are based on man's faith in the active love of God for him.

By a stylistic device, then, the action produced by an inner motivation can be indicated by the object that is desired. The biblical author describes not the process, but the goal toward which the action is directed; i.e., grammatically speaking, he connects the verb *'ahabh* with a real object which signifies an ethico-religious value or a definite type of behavior. Love for agriculture is characteristic of the king who rules prudently and sensibly (2 Ch. 26:10). He who strives for knowledge loves discipline (Prov. 12:1), but he who does not love reproof

Матеріал, захищений авторським правом

does not want to be wise (15:12). He who wants to prosper loves wisdom (19:8); he who seeks a genuine treasure loves wisdom (8:17); he serves God actively who loves his commandments, precepts, and instructions (Ps. 119 *passim*). However, he who loves a bribe necessarily manifests an unrighteous judgment (Isa. 1:23f.); he who seeks gain to his own shame loves only money and wealth (Eccl. 5:9[10]); he who has followed pernicious gluttony loves wine and oil (Prov. 21:17). He who does nothing at all and is very slothful loves sleep (Isa. 56:10; Prov. 20:13), and he who intends to stir up wickedness loves strife (Prov. 17:19). In this manner, appropriate conduct expresses desire for an object. Love and action are two sides of the same coin.

III. Secular Uses.

1. *Sexual Love.* Quell's assertion [27] that the original use of the concept of *'ahabh* belongs to the realm of sexual love, of physical desire, of lust, and even of sensual pleasure, [28] may be supported, among other ways, by the use of this root in Ugaritic: [29] *CTA*, 4 [II AB], IV-V, 38f.: "Truly, the male organ of King El will have intercourse with thee, the love of the bull will stimulate thee." *CTA*, 3 [V AB], C 3f.: "(The object of the) affection of Pdry, the daughter of the goddess of light, the love of Ṭly, the daughter of the goddess of rain...." *CTA*, 5 [I* AB], V, 18: "Aliyan Baʿal became fond of a heifer in the pasture, and a cow in the field of the lion Mametu." [30] Even if we cannot explain the entire breadth of the concept of this root in this idiom from its usage in the extant Ugaritic texts, still it is quite clear that in these Canaanite mythological statements *'hb* is used of sexual behavior.

In the OT this root is also used when referring to sexual love, to the marital relationship as something given at creation in a positive sense, although a different root (→ יָדַע *yādhaʿ*) [31] is used for the act of sexual intercourse itself. Thus the emphasis suggested by the word *'ahabh* is not really on sexual love, but more on experiencing and desiring love. [32] Isaac is fond of Rebekah (Gen. 24:67), Jacob of Rachel (29:18,20,30), Samson of a Philistine woman (Jgs. 14:16) and of Delilah (16:4,15). Accordingly, Eccl. 9:9 knows nothing better to recommend than the time which a man enjoys with the wife whom he loves. Prov. 5:18f. even praises the feeling of marital devotion with the words: "Let your fountain be blessed, and rejoice in the wife of your youth, a lovely *('ahabh)* hind, a graceful doe. Let her affection fill you at all times with delight, be infatuated always with her love." The strength aroused by love is regarded as fundamentally a marvel: "Three things are too wonderful for me; four I do not understand: the way of an eagle in the sky, the way of a serpent on a rock, the way of a ship on the high

---

27 Quell, 22.
28 Cf. Kalt, 56.
29 Cf. H. H. Hirschberg, *VT*, 11 (1961), 373; A. D. Tushingham, *JNES*, 12 (1953), 151.
30 Gordon, *UT*, 1002 (*PRU*, II, 8-11), 46, is uncertain.
31 See E. Baumann, *ZAW*, 28 (1908), 22ff.
32 Cf. Tushingham, *loc. cit.*

Матеріал, захищений авторським правом

seas, and the way of a man with a maiden" (Prov. 30:18f.). As a matter of fact, without reservation the Song of Solomon praises the rapturous experience of sexual love as a motivating power that is plainly supernatural. Indeed, a man can almost be sick from insatiable longing (Cant. 2:5; 5:8). Love is stronger than floods, stronger even than death (8:6f.). This love is holy, taboo: "Stir not up nor awaken love until it please" (2:7; 3:5; 8:4). Thus Canticles is able to praise love in full and stirring tones. What it means is not really sexuality, but eroticism, sensual experience. This love is based on complete reciprocity. The young maiden also loves her chosen one intimately and passionately (1:3), wants to be near him (1:7), seeks him on her bed by night, but does not find him (3:1), wants to rise to seek him at once in the streets and squares of the city (3:2), in order after lengthy asking and searching at last to find him and bring him into her mother's house (3:4). The love experience is a joy produced by fulfilled yearning, and is to be experienced to the greatest depth. Although we meet this view for the first time in Canticles, which was written at a late date, there can be little doubt that in all ages this common human emotion of love gave rise to similar literary gems.

These statements are altered very little by the cultic interpretation of Canticles. [33] In either case, Canticles is referring to sexual love. The only difference is that according to the cultic interpretation this assumes a figurative, symbolic meaning.

It is disastrous when one does not control his love emotion, but in unbridled passion acts in a way contrary to genuine love, thus hurting the one he loves and transgressing the law of chastity. Amnon, filled with passionate sensual desire, overpowers his unsuspecting half-sister Tamar as she cares for him with all good intentions and concern, and after he has disgraced her he drives her away and refuses to marry her (2 S.13:1-19). In this act, he transgresses the moral law in Israel (vv. 12f.). An order preserved by society also lies behind these human relationships. Such unrestrained behavior, the intention of which is not active mutual affection, but self-gratification, will ultimately change into the opposite emotions, anger and hate. Therefore, Amnon's crime was also destined to cause a disastrous development in the history of David's family–in this case, in determining who would be David's successor to the throne. It was perhaps also for this reason that the record of this event was taken up into the tradition. David himself was not free from the guilt of a similar sin. His sensual desire for Bathsheba (2 S. 11) leads him into adultery and later into the malicious murder of one of his bravest officers who was deeply devoted to him, the Hittite Uriah, who was married to Bathsheba. The court prophet Nathan reproved him severely for this act (2 S. 12). Ultimately this transgression also played an important role in determining David's successor to the throne, although this may not have been desired by David himself (1 K. 1:11-40). Love that is not consciously aware of the importance of behavior, but strives only to enjoy life without any self-restraint, must inevitably lead to complications and is to be rejected. Even where it is not explicitly stated, this ethical dimension of love in the OT is quite clear, as in the man's marital love

---

33 W. Wittekindt, *Das Hohelied und seine Beziehungen zum Ištarkult* (1926); M. Haller, *HAT,* 18; H. Schmökel, *Heilige Hochzeit und das Hohelied* (1956); H. Ringgren, *ATD,* XVI.

Матеріал, захищений авторським правом

for and fidelity to his barren wife.[34] Finally, Prov. 5–7 gives a clear and instructive description of the opposite of genuine love and of unchaste relationships with the prostitute.[35]

Love is destined to lead to grief when several rival wives belong to one man, and when he prefers one above the others (2 Ch. 11:21). The husband's preference would not necessarily be because a particular wife was blessed with a greater number of children. In fact, much more often the OT emphasizes the cases in which husbands love their wives sincerely in spite of their childlessness. Elkanah, for example, was sincerely devoted to his wife Hannah (1 S. 1:5) even though she had not yet borne him a son. He prefers her to his other wife Peninnah and puts forth great effort to comfort her in her distress. We may also call to mind the relationship between Leah and Rachel, who was barren. In spite of her barrenness, Jacob loved Rachel more deeply than Leah, who had several children (Gen. 30:1). The tension between Sarah and Hagar which arose after Ishmael's birth, when Hagar looked challengingly on her mistress (Gen. 16; 21:9-14), is also significant.

Ancient Near Eastern and OT lawgivers considered it necessary to establish specific laws to protect the children of the wife who is less loved (Dt. 21:15-17). It is obvious here that harsh treatment of innocent children necessitated the creation of such laws. The way in which Joseph was treated by his father Jacob also affords an example of a father's preference for a son of the wife he loves the best (Gen. 37:3f.).

2. *Partiality (of Parents), Affection (among Friends).* This strongly emotional characteristic of the concept of love is quite clear in descriptions of the relationship between the generations, between master and servant, and of the friendship between men. These feelings may, indeed, belong completely to the realm of the original emotions of love and friendship; there is also a danger here of a sudden change into the opposite, hate. Saul takes pleasure in David and makes him his armorbearer (1 S. 16:21). However, his preference for David decreases as David becomes successful and gains popularity with the troops (18:8f.), and changes into jealous anger. However, Jonathan's friendship with David is of greater stability; in this situation he is ready to help him who is being pursued by his suspicious father (20:17, cf. 18:3). David himself memorialized this friendship in his lament over Saul and Jonathan (2 S. 1:26). The personal relationship between master and servant (Ex. 21:5; Dt. 15:16) may be because the servant obtained from his master a wife, who was also a maidservant. In a case like this, if a servant chose to accept his freedom, he would have to give up his wife and children. Thus a servant's fidelity to his master is at least supported by his love for his wife and children.

Love between the generations was sometimes occasioned because children of the favorite wife enjoyed greater paternal affection. But other motivations are

---

[34] See below.

[35] According to Ringgren, *ATD*, XVI, 27ff., → זר *zār*, "stranger" or "foreigner," is probably to be interpreted allegorically.

Матеріал, захищений авторським правом

The call for actions that reflect genuine love has also motivated the prophets, and understandably so. To be sure, they did not use the term *ʾahabh(ah)* explicitly in this connection, but continually called for a benevolent attitude toward *personae miserae* (widows, orphans, and strangers) as such. Here again *ʾahabh* is used with a certain mode of action as its object. One must love good, hate evil, and establish justice in the gate (Am. 5:15). Accordingly, the prophets characterized unjust actions as love of evil (Hos. 12:8[7]; Mic. 3:2 [*qere*]). One must not take false oaths because Yahweh hates these things (Zec. 8:17), while love of truth, kindness, and peace is to be preferred to engaging in religious rites (8:19; Isa. 58:6f.). Thus, even if it cannot be said that the prophets were literally advocates of love for one's fellow man, still they were all opposed to egotism and selfishness, and aggressively defended the cause of the poor and oppressed. But above all, their oracles make it quite clear that helping the poor is fundamental to an enduring relationship between God and his people and between the people and their God, a relationship that compels one to action.

It was not until a rather late period that the OT expanded the concept of love to include the communion between the people and God. This was probably because *ʾahabh* primarily conveyed the idea of a purely sentimental love, which to some extent had erotic overtones. Such a concept could not be used to designate the relationship between God and his people, since they stand over against each other as Creator and creature. God is the Lord of history and his people are created by him in this history.

IV. Theological Uses.

1. *The Theological Critical Message of the Prophets.* Thus it is not evident from the beginning that the concept of love was based on God's acts in behalf of his people. Yet, perhaps a clear distinction needs to be made between God's acts in behalf of individuals and God's acts in behalf of his people as a whole. It could be that originally the relationship between God and his people was founded on a different principle than God's love for the individual. First of all, the covenant, which was initiated by God himself, unites him with his people. But by the very nature of things, they remain distinct from one another. After the covenant is sealed, they are united with one another by → חסד *chesedh*, "steadfast love." Likewise, the OT does not seem to feel that the relationship of God to the individual was motivated by the bond of love. This should already be clear from the fact that in the formation of Hebrew proper names, one who wore the name (or one who gave it) did not use the verb *ʾahabh* as a testimony to such an attitude on God's part. Nevertheless, the feeling of security in Yahweh's guidance of the individual may be understandable by a consciousness of his fatherly love (Ps. 103:13, *richam;* 2 S. 7:14). But the affirmation that God surrounds the pious or the righteous with love is also evidently late. It is primarily the Deuteronomist who has considered Yahweh's deeds in behalf of the patriarchs a work of love (Dt. 4:37) (cf. Isa. 41:8, where the verb *bachar*, "choose," is linked with Abraham as God's *ʾohebh*, "friend"). Thus this idea also occurs in writings which were revised in the Deuteronomistic spirit (2 S. 12:24, Yahweh

Material com direitos autorais

loves Solomon; cf. on the other hand Jedidiah, → ידיד *yādhîdh*). Yahweh's love for the Patriarchs also includes his love for their descendants, Israel. But Yahweh's attitude toward Cyrus (Isa. 48:14) shows that this electing love is not limited to Israel. The intention here is to emphasize that Cyrus is the submissive executor of Yahweh's will and the chosen mediator of the divine decision. But the statements found in Ps. 146:8; Prov. 3:12; 8:17,21; and Neh. 13:26 also come from a later period. The statement in Prov. 15:9, "But he loves him who pursues righteousness," may indeed be preexilic, but this proves little when it comes to arguing for an early origin of the idea of Yahweh's love for the righteous or pious individual.

Against this background, we can see quite clearly why Hosea's attempts to present Yahweh's relationship to his people under the figure of his own marriage must have struck his contemporaries as daring and even scandalous. We cannot go into the problem of Hos. 1 and 3 in detail here,[43] but it should be clear that the prophet Hosea manifested a new understanding of God's relationship to his people and of their response to his deeds. We cannot know for certain whether some of Hosea's predecessors held this same interpretation.[44] Perhaps the concept of Yahweh's covenant with the people of Israel[45] provided the impetus for the idea of a marital bond between Yahweh and his people. However, marriage is also understood as a covenant (→ ברית *b^{e}rîth*, Mal. 2:14). Here, this concept is not understood as sacral, but as civil.[46] It is worthy of note that Hosea's use of the concept of love to express his understanding of God's nature reflects the original meaning of the word *'ahabh* as love between husband and wife. It is hardly likely that Hosea derived this figure from the Canaanite understanding of the cult and of God. On the contrary, Hosea probably speaks apologetically against Canaanite practices, because he (like Jeremiah later) is committed to the concept of marital fidelity, but strongly opposes a mere gratification of sexual lust. Thus it is clear that for Hosea love is expressed in a loving attitude toward the person loved. Yahweh instructs Hosea to marry a harlot, and even commands him to love his wife who went after another man. Both of these events are to be interpreted as symbolic statements concerning Yahweh's love for his unfaithful people. The reason that there was discord in this marriage is that the wife did not remain faithful to her husband. She did not act in a manner consistent with love, but went after her lovers (piel ptcp. *me'ahabh*, 2:7,9,12, 14,15[5,7,10,12,13]). At Peor, Israel had already shown her infidelity (9:10, *'ohabh*). After the settlement in the land of Canaan, she looked on the gifts of the soil not as gifts of Yahweh, but of Baal (2:10[8]), and worshipped him. Israel's refusal to reciprocate God's love or her misdirected love is an expression of her inner alienation from God (8:9). Israel lowered herself to the level of a harlot, she gave herself over to foreigners. Understandably, this provoked her

---

[43] Cf. on this T. H. Robinson, *HAT*, 14 ([3]1964), 2f.; H. W. Wolff, *Hosea* (trans. 1974); W. Rudolph, *Hosea. KAT*, XIII/1; and other comms. *in loc.*

[44] Cf. Ziegler, 64f.

[45] *Ibid.*, 73-77.

[46] De Vaux, *AncIsr*, 33.

Material com direitos autorais

husband to wrath. His love changed to antipathy. He divorced his wife. This reaction is wholly in keeping with the OT concept of love and marriage. And yet, Yahweh's love ultimately overcomes his wrath against his people (14:5[4]; cf. 11:9a), and once again he draws them unto him with bands of love (11:4).[47]

Among the prophets that came after Hosea's time, Jeremiah in particular took up this figure of marital love. But he distinguishes between Israel's first love when she was a bride (Jer. 2:2) and followed her husband faithfully in the wilderness, and her behavior after the settlement in the land of Canaan. At that time Israel yielded herself to other enticements, which the prophet Jeremiah characterizes as marital infidelity. In doing so, he uses in particular the figure of the hierodule, which was probably very widespread in his day and designates a love-affair with the god of fertility. Israel goes after lovers (2:20,23,25; 30:14). But genuine love for and fidelity to Yahweh excludes a sacral sexual pleasure. The prophet presents this behavior in an abundance of figures, from bowing down as a harlot upon every high hill and under every green tree (2:20; 3:6,13), to a female camel in heat (2:23f.). Sensual desire for the world of the god of fertility replaced grateful obedience to and love for Yahweh. Israel's false love also manifested itself in her adoption of the star cult (8:2), the worship of the queen of heaven (7:18; 19:13; 44:17). Thus Israel brought catastrophe upon herself. But Yahweh cannot be angry with his people forever. Thus he draws Ephraim unto him again in love. Faithfulness causes him to let mercy prevail over justice (31:3f.).

Ezekiel took over from Hosea and Jeremiah the figure of marriage to describe the relationship between Yahweh and his unfaithful people, and developed it in ways that are harsh, even crass (Ezk. 16; 23). He focusses not only on the people of Judah and Israel, but in a special way on the cities of Jerusalem and Samaria as their capitals. Yahweh chose Jerusalem, or Jerusalem and Samaria, from Egypt, saved them, and provided for them abundantly. But they turned away from him, failed to practice pure marital love to their Lord Yahweh, joined themselves to lovers (16:33,36,37; 23:5,9,22), and thus became harlots. Therefore Yahweh will punish them.

Finally, the figure of marriage also appears in Deutero-Isaiah (Isa. 43:4; 49:14ff.; 51:17ff., maternal love). Here, however, as in Trito-Isaiah (62:4f.; 63:9), Yahweh is at work to bring back all the lost and to restore a right relationship between himself and his people, or the city of Jerusalem, based on love and compassion. In later prophecy we encounter this figure of love occasionally, but without any clear reference to the character of love expressed by the *marital* relationship. Yahweh will rejoice again over his people (Zeph. 3:17). Yahweh loves Jacob, but hates Edom (Mal. 1:2; 2:11). The Chronicler's history regards the giving of a king to Israel as a work of God's love (2 Ch. 2:10[11]; 9:8). Perhaps 1 K. 10:9 should be interpreted in the same way.

2. *Pareneses of the Deuteronomist.* The Deuteronomic pareneses use the concept of genuine love, apart from the figure of marriage, extensively, and

---

47 See above, II.1.

Materiál chránený autorskými právy

enlarge on its theological and ethical significance (Dt. 7:8,13; 23:6[5]; 30:16,20). That which Israel has is Yahweh's gift. Yahweh gave it to Israel because of his love for them. He saved the forefathers from the time of the patriarchs, i.e., for the sake of his oath he led the people out of Egypt, promised them the land, and caused them to multiply. Yahweh's love expressed itself in action in behalf of his chosen people. Here the concept of love has been separated from the realm of the original idea of sensuality, and theologically has become the original basis for Yahweh's benevolent deeds in his people's behalf, even though the love reciprocated to him by his people has proved to be weak and powerless. Yahweh's love is the prototype for love in general. He gives out of his own initiative, but he desires that the people he loves unite themselves unto him alone. In light of the recognizable connections between Hosea and Deuteronomy, it is quite possible that Deuteronomy took over this figure from the prophet Hosea. The Deuteronomist's concept of love differs from that of Hosea, which was derived from the background of sexual love and marriage, and here he has made a notable advancement in the OT concept of the knowledge of God.

Perhaps the intention of Deuteronomy was to teach Israel pedagogically her duty to reciprocate God's love, not in the original sense of emotion, but in the form of genuine obedience and pure devotion (cf. Jer. 2:2). Since the Deuteronomist defines God's relationship to his people and their fathers according to his own theological concept of love, he can hardly give any advice other than that the only possible way for Israel to live is in a love, fidelity, and devotion to Yahweh which reciprocates this love: "you shall love the Lord your God with all your heart, and with all your soul, and with all your might" (Dt. 6:5). The question has been raised as to how such love as this can be commanded. However, if love is not merely an emotional feeling for a person or a thing, but also involves a behavior that is becoming to love, then it is possible for Deuteronomy to elevate this behavior to the level of a commandment. The Deuteronomist is not a prophet who at God's bidding must criticize the people's behavior in a specific situation, but he is a teacher who wishes to immortalize such criticism in binding, timeless teachings in order that Israel might live in Yahweh's land a life which he blesses and with which he alone is pleased. It is in this sense that Yahweh tells his people to love, to keep his commandments out of love, and to subject themselves to him in obedience.[48] He calls on them to keep his *mitsvoth*, "commandments" (5:10; 7:9; cf. Ps. 119:47,48,97,113,119,127,140,159,163,165, 167), to serve him (Dt. 10:12; 11:13), to obey his voice (30:20), to walk in his ways and to cleave to him (11:22; 19:9). This love of just and obedient behavior constrains man even more when he is convicted that Yahweh himself loves justice and righteousness (cf. also Ps. 33:5; 37:28). Thus the Israelite is forced to make a decision: "See, I have set before you this day life and good, death and evil. If you obey the commandments of the Lord your God which I command you this day, by loving the Lord your God, by walking in his ways, and by keeping his commandments and his statutes and his ordinances, then you shall live and multiply, and the Lord your God will bless you in the land which you are entering to

---

48 On the political concept of love, cf. above, I.2.

Materiál chráněný autorskými právy

him in return. Not only does this give rise to the demand for cult centralization and cult purity, but also it is made concrete by joy in Yahweh's public worship (Ps. 27:4), by love for his sanctuary in Jerusalem (Lam. 1:2; Isa. 66:10; Ps. 26:8; 122:6), or by love for his name (Ps. 5:12[11]; 69:37[36]; Isa. 56:6). In the sanctuary, where men call on Yahweh's name together, they concentrate on his presence and his love. This love for the sanctuary is in harmony with Yahweh's love for the gates of Jerusalem (Ps. 51:21[19]; 87:2[1]). In this way, Israel's love for Yahweh has been made objective. This love for Yahweh in the cult was not considered to contradict one's love for neighbor, brother, stranger, or even enemy. The unity of the godly or of the godly community was effected chiefly by the worship of Yahweh, and in conjunction with this one's own personal behavior tended to be neglected. In light of this one-sided understanding of godliness, the prophetic criticism of the cult and the love of God practiced in the cult is completely understandable and necessary. In the cult God is present through his sanctuary and the ritual. Consequently, this form of love for God is always in danger of forgetting genuine brotherly love. This sort of divine service induces one to limit love for neighbor to the narrow circle of his fellow believers (cf. 1QS 1:9f.: "that they may love all the sons of light, . . . and that they may hate all the sons of darkness"). In truth, this kind of piety is so close to the attitude of the introvert and the self-centered that it constantly threatens a genuine relationship of love between God and man, and man and God.

4. *Qumran.* This concept of the love of God bore fruit later in the Qumran community. According to the Damascus Document, God is merciful to them that love for him (CD B 2:20f.), indeed he had already loved Israel's ancestors (CD A 8:15f.; B 1:28-30), because Abraham had not gone astray like the other sons of Noah and was made a friend of God (CD A 3:2), and so his sons also were inscribed as friends of God (CD A 3:3). God loves not only those who had gone before, but also those who followed after (CD A 8:17; B 1:29f.) for the sake of the covenant (cf. Dt. 7:8; 10:15). In other words, he loves the Spirit (of Light) (1QS 3:26) and takes pleasure in its works.

Thus those who belong to the community will also love him out of free will (1QH 14:26) and act according to his will, because they love what he has chosen (1QS 1:3), what he loves (1QH 14:10[?]; 15:9f.), and hate what he abhors. In this love the members of the community are united to one another (1QS 1:9). In faithful love they belong to one another, they think justly and preserve the holy community (1QS 2:24; cf. 5:4,25; 8:2), and they love one another according to the abundance of their portion (1QH 14:19).

In general, the principal factor determining admission into the community is insight into the revelation according to which one can (1QS 9:16) and must (1QS 9:21) love the one and hate the other. Only the person who loves God's correction is admitted into the community (1QH 2:14).

This idea of God's love for his community is appropriately based on the concept of his love for the patriarchs in Deuteronomy. It demands a reciprocal love on the part of those who are chosen as well as love for one's fellow man. But this is binding only in the circle of the community itself; those who are rejected as

Materiál chráněný autorskými právy

members are hated. In the Qumran literature we do not find concrete commandments to act in a manner becoming of love in the theological and ethico-social sense. Rather, love has become a comprehensive term for the feeling of the relationship between God, the community, and the individual members of the community, a way of designating the self-understanding of the conventicle. The idea of love as an expression of human association has in the Qumran community lost contact with its original concept and dynamic. [51]

Wallis

---

[51] *TDNT*, I, 38-55, goes into the ways in which the Rabbis, Hellenistic Judaism, and the NT interpret love.

אֹהֶל 'ōhel; אָהַל 'āhal

Contents: I. Grammar and Etymology: 1. Word Formation and Frequency of Occurrence; 2. Meaning in Other Semitic Languages. II. The Tent in Daily Use and During Festivals: 1. The Nomadic Tent; 2. Use by the Inhabitants of the Land; 3. *'ohel* As a Solemn Expression; 4. *'ohel* with Ethical Predicates. III. The Heavenly Tent. IV. Tent Sanctuaries: 1. Ancient Near Eastern; 2. Arabic; 3. *'ohel (mo'edh)* in Pentateuchal Strata Before the Priestly Code; 4. Tent Sanctuary and Tent Tradition After the Settlement; 5. The Tent of Yahweh in Jerusalem; 6. The *'ohel mo'edh* of the Priestly Code; 7. The Postexilic Tent.

I. Grammar and Etymology.

1. *Word Formation and Frequency of Occurrence.* The segholate noun *'ohel* occurs 340 times in the OT. [1] A (denominative?) verb is derived from the root *'hl*, which appears twice in the qal, once in the piel in the sense "to tabernacle,"

'ōhel. A. Alt, "Zelte und Hütten," *Alttestamentliche Studien F. Nötscher ... gewidmet. BBB*, 1 (1950), 16-25 = *KlSchr*, III, 233-242, cited hereafter; G. Cornfeld, *Pictorial Biblical Encyclopedia* (1964), 673-77; German ed. G. J. Botterweck, *Die Bibel und ihre Welt*, II (1969), 1381-89; F. M. Cross, "The Tabernacle," *BA*, 10 (1947), 45-68; Dalman, *AuS*, VI, 1-145; G. H. Davies, "Tabernacle," *IDB*, IV, 498-506; J. Dus, "Gibeon–eine Kultstätte des Šmš und die Stadt des benjaminitischen Schicksals," *VT*, 10 (1960), 353-374; *idem*, "Der Brauch der Ladewanderung im alten Israel," *ThZ*, 17 (1961), 1-16; *idem*, "Noch zum Brauch der 'Ladewanderung'," *VT*, 13 (1963), 126-132; *idem*, "Die Erzählung über den Verlust der Lade 1 Sam 4," *VT*, 13 (1963), 333-37; *idem*, "Die Thron- und Bundeslade," *ThZ*, 20 (1964), 241-251; D. W. Gooding, *The Account of the Tabernacle* (1959); M. Görg, *Das Zelt der Begegnung. Untersuchungen zur Gestalt der sakralen Zelttraditionen Altisraels. BBB*, 27 (1967); M. Haran, "'Oṭfe, maḥmal and ḳubbe. Notes on the Study of the Origins of Biblical Cult Forms: The Problem of Arabic Parallels," *D. Neiger Memorial Volume* (1959), 215-221; *idem*, "The Nature of the ''Ōhel Mô'ēdh' in Pentateuchal Sources," *JSS*, 5 (1960), 50-65; *idem*, "The Complex of Ritual Acts

(continued on p. 119)

[1] *KBL.*

Materiál chráněný autorskými právy

ʾohel, "tent," and then only when *ʾohel* has reference to a group of tents. In Ps. 52:7(5), the writer describes Yahweh bringing death on man by saying that he tears him from his *ʾohel,* "tent." Job 19:12 says that God brings many troops against the tent of a man with whom he is angry (cf. Job 20:26). The idea of putting the tent sanctuary of Yahweh in its own place may have arisen from the fact that man's dwelling place was called a tent. According to Ps. 132:2-5, David returned to the *ʾohel* of his house after he had found a dwelling place (*mishkanoth*–a popular expression, which is parallel to *ʾohel*) for the God of Jacob (cf. Isa. 16:5). In Ps. 84:2(1), the *mishkanoth,* "dwelling place," of Yahweh is praised. It is much better to be a doorkeeper in the house of Yahweh than to dwell in the tents of the wicked (*reshaʿ*) (v. 11[10]).

More often, the dwelling places of a whole people are summed up as their *ʾohalim,* "tents." This is the case not only with nomadic peoples like Kedar (Cant. 1:5) and Edom (Ps. 83:7[6]), but also of Jacob (Jer. 30:18; Mal. 2:12) and Judah (Zec. 12:7; cf. Jer. 4:20; Hos. 9:6; Ps. 78:55; Lam. 2:4).

4. *ʾohel with Ethical Predicates.* Since a tent and its inhabitants form a unit, a tent can be filled with good or evil forces; and within the sphere of activity affecting one's destiny, it can impart to anyone who enters it a condition corresponding to the respective forces that control it. Statements like "the light (of the wicked) is dark in his tent" (Job 18:6) or "there are those who are incredibly negligent in their tents" (12:6) provide a transition to such ideas. In times of prosperity God "protects" one's tent (Job 29:4, LXX). This idea is even clearer where the tents of the righteous, *tsaddiqim* (Ps. 118:15) or *yesharim* (Prov. 14:11), are extolled, while those of the wicked *(reshaʿim)* are deplored (Job 8:22; 21:28). A tent can actually embody safety or peace *(shalom)* within it (Job 5:24). But wickedness *(ʿavlah)* can also dwell in it (Job 11:14; 22:23), as is the case with the tents of the wicked (*ʾohole reshaʿ,* Ps. 84:11[10]) or the tents of bribery (*shochadh,* Job 15:34). Since a man's deed as the source of his future destiny is localized in his dwelling place, the *ʾohel,* "tent," becomes his trust and confidence (*mibhtach,* Job 18:14).

Since the ethically colored use of *ʾohel* is evident particularly in Job, we should not make generalizations about this use. The frequent use of this word in Job is probably to be explained by the inclusion of Job and his friends among the children of the East (→ קדם *qedhem*), who ordinarily dwell in tents, although the rich Job and his family have houses (1:4,13f.,18).

Thus, the use of *ʾohel* in the general sense of "dwelling" is limited to a few linguistic areas. *ʾohel* is by no means used for "dwelling of any kind." [16]

III. The Heavenly Tent. The only preexilic example of the use of *ʾohel* for the heavenly tent is Ps. 104:2. Yahweh, who covers himself with light as with a garment, is extolled hymnically: "who hast stretched out *(natah)* the heavens like a tent, / who hast laid the beams of thy chambers on the waters (above), /

---

[16] *AuS,* VI, 9; cf. Michaelis, 371, n. 10.

Copyrighted material

who makest the clouds thy chariot, / who ridest on the wings of the wind *(ruach)*."

Unfortunately the idea intended here is no longer clear. Is the psalmist merely expressing figuratively his awe that God had easily stretched out the firmament like a tent cloth?[17] Or is he comparing two different views derived from two different ways of life: a Bedouin tent as immense as heaven, and a massive, two-storied rural building having within it waters on which vessels (or beams) float?[18] The concept in v. 5 of the earth being set *(yasadh)* on its foundations supports this latter concept of heaven.

Heaven plays an important role as *'ohel* in Deutero-Isaiah, especially in the hymnic passages where the vocabulary is firmly established. The solidly established (*raqa'*, *yasadh*, *'asah*) earth always stands as a tent dwelling for mankind over against heaven, which is spread out *(natah)* with a substance light as *doq* (veil? gauze?)[19] (Isa. 40:21f.; cf. 42:5; 44:24; 45:12; 51:13; cf. 51:16 in the Syriac). Apparently Deutero-Isaiah knows nothing about the idea of a vault of heaven (→ רקיע *rāqîa'*), which is so dominant elsewhere in the OT. In connection with the heavenly tent, Deutero-Isaiah speaks of divine actions toward kings and princes of the nations (40:23; 42:5; 44:24-28; 45:13), of giving authentic oracles (40:21f.; 42:9; 45:11; 51:16), or of destroying heathen oracles (44:25). This connection of the tent with oracles reminds one of the tent sanctuary in the period before the Priestly Code;[20] cf. also the gift of the *ruach*, "spirit," in 42:5 with Nu. 11:16ff.

The later passages, Jer. 10:12=51:15; Zec. 12:1; Job 9:8, move in the same realm of ideas. They also contrast the solidly established earth with the expanded heaven (Job 9:6), and it is probably no accident that they refer to the *ruach* in their larger context (Jer. 10:13f.; 51:16f.; Zec. 12:1).

IV. Tent Sanctuaries.

1. *Ancient Near Eastern.* The nomads of the ancient Near East must have hidden their holy objects under a canvas (tent) roof because they especially wanted to protect them. Unfortunately no direct accounts of this have yet been found. However, among Semites who had become settled down, we still find the idea that deities (at appointed times) live in tents. This is expressed most clearly in Ugaritic myths and epics where deities are said to go out of their *'hl*, which is also called *mšknt (miškanatu).*[21] According to Diodorus (xx. 65.1), the Carthaginians carried a holy tent with them into battle.[22] Other examples are less certain. A demi-relief from the temple of Bel at Palmyra depicts something like a red tent on a camel, and behind this three female figures, perhaps goddesses.[23]

---

17 Duhm, *KHC*.
18 Gunkel, *GHK*.
19 *KBL*.
20 See below.
21 *CTA*, 17 [II D], V, 30f.; *CTA*, 15 [III K], III, 18.
22 Smith-Stübe, *Religion*, 25.
23 *Syr*, 15 (1934), Plate XIX.

Copyrighted material

which 120 appear in P, and 6 in Ch.) call it the *ʾohel moʿedh,*[36] which is usually translated "tent of meeting" (between Yahweh and Moses, or Yahweh and Israel). But some scholars have suggested that it be translated "tent of assembly" of divine beings,[37] or "tent of assembly for a festival."[38] Luther translated "Stiftshütte" because of the medieval distinction between parish churches and collegiate churches. Ex. 33:7-11; Nu. 11:16-29; 12; Dt. 31:14f., speak of the *ʾohel (moʿedh)* in passages which have been loosely inserted into the context, and which are characterized by their being "loaded with problems," unlike most other Pentateuchal legends. The term *moʿedh* is suspect in all passages of later origin, since in surrounding passages we find simply *haʾohel.* (The combination *ʾohel moʿedh* cannot be demonstrated with certainty earlier than in P.)

Ex. 33:7-11 belongs to the Sinai complex. In a series of sentences using *vav* with the perfect,[39] Moses is instructed[40] to pitch a tent outside the Israelite camp and to call it *ʾohel (moʿedh).*[41] Yahweh appears there in a pillar of cloud when necessity requires, and speaks to Moses "face to face" about problems that are vital to the people. In the present context, the intention of this paragraph is to indicate the place where God reveals himself in order that communication with the God of Sinai might continue after the people leave this region.

According to Nu. 11:16-29, Yahweh appears shortly after the departure from Sinai. After the people murmur at the *ʾohel (moʿedh),* he takes 70 portions of the *ruach,* "spirit," of Moses, and distributes them to the elders of Israel, who then begin to prophesy. In connection with this story, Nu. 12 tells how Miriam and Aaron murmur against Moses' foreign wife and his special position before Yahweh. Yahweh, who appears at the tent, teaches them the difference between a prophet and God's servant, Moses, and punishes Miriam with leprosy. It is only through Moses' intercession that her illness is taken away.

Dt. 31:14f. deals with the end of Israel's wandering in the wilderness just before Moses' death. Yahweh commissions Moses to appoint Joshua as his successor at the *(moʿedh-)*tent, by which the Israelites had been led up to that time.

The similarity of ideas and choice of words in these four paragraphs is striking. Admittedly, they say nothing about the design of the tent. But they do make a number of things clear: (a) Moses had the unique privilege of an intimate relationship with God at the tent; Yahweh spoke with him "face to face" (Ex. 33:11), "mouth to mouth," and Moses beheld his → תמונה *tᵉmûnāh* (an image of God?) (Nu. 12:8). (b) The tent was located outside the camp, and one had to go out (*yatsaʾ*, Ex. 33:7f.; Nu. 11:26; 12:4) to it, while all the tents where the people lived had doors which faced toward the holy tent (Ex. 33:8). (c) When a person came near the tent or went into it, he presented himself in a specified way

---

[36] Kuschke, 82.

[37] H. Gressmann, *Mose und seine Zeit* (1913), and G. Beer, *HAT,* 3 (1939), on Ex. 33:7ff.; cf. Isa. 14:13 and Ugar. *mʿd.*

[38] Wilson, *JNES,* 4 (1945), 245; cf. Cross, 65.

[39] This is ritual style; see K. Koch, *Die Priesterschrift . . . ,* 96f.

[40] So Baentsch, *GHK,* in contradistinction from more recent commentaries which find here an iterative narrative.

[41] According to the LXX and Syriac, the reference is to Moses' own tent, which now receives sacral consecration; cf. Görg, 155.

Copyrighted material

(*hithyatstsebh,* Nu. 11:16; Dt. 31:14 [twice]; cf. Ex. 33:8). (d) Yahweh came down (*yaradh,* Ex. 33:9; Nu. 11:17,25; 12:5) in the pillar of cloud and appeared to the people (Dt. 31:15; Ex. 33:10), whereas the pillar stood (*ʿamadh,* Ex. 33:9f.; Nu. 12:5; Dt. 31:15) at the door of the tent. (e) Aside from Moses, only Joshua, as servant, is connected with the tent (Ex. 33:11; Nu. 11:28; Dt. 31:14f.). These points of agreement suggest that the four passages originated in the same circle of authors. Often scholars assign them to E because they refer to prophets, and E is the only Pentateuchal source that mentions prophets.[42] Noth thinks that three of these passages were late insertions in J,[43] and that Dt. 31:14f. was a late insertion by a Deuteronomistic hand.[44]

Nothing is said about sacrifices and rites in these passages except for the two references to the people rising up and worshipping (Ex. 33:8,10) when Moses officiated at the sanctuary. Only Ex. 33:7 states that any one who sought *(mebhaqqesh)* Yahweh would go out to the tent. Thus the tent seems to have been chiefly a place where oracles were given, which is also suggested by its connection with the prophetic task in Nu. 11f. However, *biqqesh,* "seek," can also mean the pilgrimage to the "epiphany of Yahweh" at the festival.[45]

It is disputed whether we are to assume a connection between the *moʿedh*-tent and the ark in these passages. The only basis for making such a connection is the statement in Ex. 33:7, *venatah lo michuts lammachaneh,* "and (Moses used to) pitch . . . outside the camp." The point at issue here is how one is to interpret the little word *lo.* (a) Some scholars delete it with the LXX, (b) others apply it to Moses ("for himself"),[46] (c) others apply it to Yahweh ("for him"),[47] (d) and still others apply it to the ark, which originally had been mentioned in the foregoing text, but had subsequently been omitted.[48]

Viewed historically, if this tent actually goes back to the period before Israel's conquest of Canaan, there is no reason to disconnect it from the person of Moses.

4. *Tent Sanctuary and Tent Tradition After the Settlement.* Usually it is assumed that the narratives concerning the *ʾohel (moʿedh)* may be traced back to a roving sanctuary of nomadic peoples who later became Israelite tribes, a sanctuary which became unnecessary soon after the conquest and vanished. There is uncertainty, however, as to the region and tribal league in which it was used before it vanished. (a) According to de Vaux, the last place it was located historically was Baal-peor in Transjordan (Nu. 25:6).[49] (b) Since the Jerusalemite prophet Nathan opposed king David's plans to build a temple with the argument that since the exodus from Egypt Yahweh had moved about in Israel "in a tent and a dwelling" (2 S. 7:1-6), some scholars have concluded that he is refer-

---

42 So recently Haran, *JSS,* 52; Görg, 138-170.
43 *OTL* on Ex. 33:7ff.; Nu. 11:16ff.; chap. 12.
44 *A History of Pentateuchal Traditions* (trans. 1971), 32f., n. 126.
45 W. Beyerlin, *Origins and History of the Oldest Sinaitic Traditions* (trans. 1965), 122f.
46 Baentsch, *GHK;* Noth, *OTL;* Haran, *JSS,* 53.
47 Gressmann, *SAT;* Beer, *HAT,* 3.
48 Holzinger, *KHC;* Eissfeldt, *Hexateuchsynopse* (1922), 274*; Beyerlin, 114.
49 De Vaux, 297.

Copyrighted material

5. *The Tent of Yahweh in Jerusalem.* According to the (redactional) note in 1 K. 8:4, when Solomon dedicated the temple, he transferred not only the ark of Yahweh, but also the *ʾohel moʿedh,* to the newly erected sanctuary. In 2 Ch. 5:5, the Chronicler assumes that Solomon brought the tent to the temple from Gibeon, while the context of the books of Samuel and Kings suggests that the tent Solomon brought to the temple was the one David had erected some ten years earlier in his capital as a protection for the ark which he transferred to Jerusalem at that time (2 S. 6:17). Furthermore, it is certain that the ark and the tent were connected from the time that David brought the ark to Jerusalem.

The tent David erected in Jerusalem is not called *ʾohel moʿedh,* but *ʾohel yhvh,* "tent of Yahweh." It must have been relatively large, because not only was the anointing oil kept there, which the priest Zadok had to have in order to anoint Solomon (1 K. 1:39), but also inside this tent there was an altar with horns where the commander-in-chief Joab sought protection (1 K. 2:28-34), although he was unable to escape from his rival Benaiah. This is the first passage in which the concept of asylum appears along with the tent, but it seems to be connected with the altar more strongly than with the tent.

If there is a historical nucleus in the conversation between David and Nathan in 2 S. 7:1-7, then it indicates that Nathan looked on the Jerusalem tent as a successor to the earlier *(moʿedh-)*tent.[59] He assumes that it was moved from tribe to tribe by a decree of Yahweh in order to impart the role of leadership to the tribe in question: "I have been moving about in a tent and a dwelling. / In all places where I have moved among all the Israelites, / did I speak a word with any of the tribes of Israel, / whom I commanded to shepherd my people Israel, saying, / 'Why have you not built me a house of cedar?'" (2 S. 7:6f.). Regardless of whether or not the Davidic tent of Yahweh was brought into the Solomonic temple and kept (folded up) in one of its chambers, terminology accruing to the tent became a part of the language of the temple. The Psalms extol the temple as a tent, especially in connection with the concept of asylum (Ps. 27:5; 61:5[4]; cf. 15:1; 78:60; and Isa. 33:20f.). The idea of the tent as a symbol of leadership (presumably with regard to the Jerusalem tradition) seems to lie behind the allegorical historical presentation in Ezk. 23, where the two wives of Yahweh, *ʾoholah* = Samaria,[60] and *ʾoholibhah* = Jerusalem, "(my) cult tent is in her," are described in their degradation.[61] In both cases the idea seems to be that the tent was supposed to be Yahweh's possession, but his two wives were maintaining their own tents, i.e., their own separate realms of authority.

6. *The ʾohel moʿedh of the Priestly Code.* Nowhere in the OT is so much importance attributed to the holy tent as in the P account of the giving of the law at Sinai in Ex. 25–Nu. 10. On Mt. Sinai, Moses was shown a pattern (→ תבנית *tabhnîth*) of the *moʿedh*-tent (Ex. 25:9), which P prefers to call → משכן *mishkān,* and he built it according to that pattern, and used it during the wilderness wander-

---

59 Von Rad, see above; Kuschke, 95f.
60 A feminine form? Or should we read *ʾoholah,* "who has a tent sanctuary," *GesB, KBL?*
61 On the interpretation of these names, cf. Zimmerli, *BK,* XIII/1, 541f.

ably from P, as Koch *(Priesterschrift)* and Görg have attempted. According to this approach, the early stratum referred to a tent sanctuary without vertical walls, but with the ark, the table of the Presence, a lampstand and an Aaronic priesthood. In this stratum, the tent sanctuary was not yet called *(ʾohel) moʿedh*. Unfortunately, it is not possible to determine the time or the place in which these cultic elements originated.

In the period after the destruction of the Solomonic temple, P describes the "tabernacle" of the Mosaic period as the program for the anticipated reconstruction in Jerusalem. For this purpose, P transformed the cult tent, which was considered to be Mosaic, into a miniature pattern of the temple that was yet to be built. In order to preserve the length of the tent sanctuary, the dimensions of the Jerusalem temple were reduced to half their actual size, and the entrance halls of the temple were eliminated. In the ancient tent, a wooden substructure was made out of planks which were set up vertically and fastened to each other. It was made in the form of a block house 30 cubits long, 10 cubits wide, and 10 cubits high. It had no permanent covering. In place of this there was a magnificent covering adorned with cherubim, which hung down on the outside of the wooden partitions and was called a *mishkan* (26:1-6). The curtains of the traditional tent sanctuary and the two protective coverings probably were not simply laid over the wooden partitions, but were stretched out on the side with tent-pegs. [65]

P took over from Jerusalem the separation of the Holy Place from the (cubical) holy of holies as its design, as well as the theophany of the divine → כבוד *kābhôdh*, "glory." However, in P the "glory" is no longer connected with the great New Year Festival, but appears unexpectedly at times of severe calamity (Nu. 14:10; 16:19; 17:7[16:42]; 20:6). P also took over observance of the great sacrifices from Jerusalem, but they are made to serve P's viewpoint, especially with regard to atonement (→ כפר *kipper*) and remission of sins. Nothing is said in P about the tent being a place where oracles were given. Instead of this, the longing for cultic holiness in the midst of the people is emphasized. Presumably the ark (like the altar of burnt offering in the outer court) [66] is located in the holy of holies and is a center of the holy region. From the holy of holies outward, holiness streams in concentric circles and on a gradually descending scale the further one is removed from the center. [67] This explains the careful and deliberate use of gold, silver, or bronze, or violet purple, reddish purple, crimson red, or white materials, and the offices of the high priest (=Aaron), priests, and Levites in connection with the tent sanctuary. In order to promote holiness, the tent sanctuary is moved into the center of the camp, where the individual tribes can camp around it according to a specific plan (Nu. 2).

The sanctuary arranged thus, providing blessing and atonement, is the goal of God's way with Israel, indeed with creation. With its completion, Israel is really a people and Yahweh is truly God. In the sanctuary, the static idea of holiness is united with a dynamic concept of the always unexpected irruptive

---

65 Cf. the illustrations in *BHHW*, III, 1873f.
66 "Lageplan," *BHHW*, III, 1875.
67 Koch, *ZThK*, 41-45.

Bahan dengan hak cipta

meeting of God with his people, which gave rise to the expression "tent of *mo'edh* (meeting)." As in the old narratives, the door of the tent also plays an important role here: "I will meet with you there, to speak there to you (Moses). / There I will meet the people of Israel, / and it shall be sanctified by my glory; / I will consecrate the *mo'edh*-tent and the altar; / Aaron also and his sons I will consecrate, to serve me as priests. / And I will dwell among the people of Israel, / and will be their God. / And they shall know that I am the Lord their God, / who brought them forth out of the land of Egypt / that I might dwell among them; / I am the Lord their God" (Ex. 29:42-46).

7. *The Postexilic Tent*. The disappearance of the holy tent in the Solomonic temple gave rise to the legend in the postexilic period that Jeremiah dragged the *'ohel* out of the temple before it was destroyed and hid it in an unknown place, where it will be discovered in the eschaton (2 Macc. 2:4-8). The Samaritans state that Joshua hid the tent in the synagogue on Gerizim. [68] Such speculations concerning the tent of God help to explain why the LXX attributes to the tent much greater importance than the NT does. [69]

Koch

---

[68] J. Bowman, "Samaritanische Probleme," *F. Delitzsch–Vorlesung* [1957] (1967), 23.

[69] See *TDNT*.

אוֹב *'ôbh*

Contents: I. 1. Orthography; 2. Etymology. II. The Ancient Near Eastern Background. III. Use in the OT.

I. 1. *Orthography*. In the singular this word is written in the *plene* form (אוֹב *'ôbh*), but in the plural it is written defectively (אֹבוֹת *'ōbhôth*). [1] The *scriptio defectiva* in the plural makes it possible to confuse *'obhoth* with *'abhoth*, "fathers," even if the suggested emendation of *'abhotham* to *'obhoth* in Job 8:8 is more clever than convincing. [2]

'ôbh. W. F. Albright, *Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan* (London, 1968); C. J. Gadd, *Ideas of Divine Rule in the Ancient East* (London, 1948); H. A. Hoffner, "Second Millennium Antecedents to the Hebrew *'ōb*," *JBL*, 86 (1967), 385-401; H. Schmidt, "אוֹב," *Festschrift K. Marti. BZAW*, 41 (1925), 253-261; F. Schmidtke, "Träume, Orakel und Totengeister als Künder der Zukunft in Israel und Babylonien," *BZ*, 11 (1967), 240-46; M. Vieyra, "Les noms du 'mundus' en hittite et en assyrien et la pythonisse d'Endor," *RHA*, 69 (1961), 47-55.

[1] *GK*, § 81.

[2] Albright, 142, n. 85.

Bahan dengan hak cipta

2. *Etymology.* At least three views of the etymology of *'obh* have been suggested. According to one view, *'obh* is the same word that means a "bottle made out of skins" which holds wine, in Job 32:19.[3] This would mean that the technique of necromancy was labelled ventriloquism. The LXX uses *engastrímythos,* "ventriloquist," in all passages except Isa. 29:4, where *'obh me'erets* is rendered by *hoi phōnoúntes ek tḗs gḗs,* "the ones calling out of the earth." Sometimes the Vulgate reads *magus,* "sorcerer" (1 S. 28:3; Lev. 19:31; 20:6), and sometimes *python,* "diviner" (Isa. 8:19; 29:4; 2 K. 21:6; 23:24; Dt. 18:11; Lev. 20:27). According to a second view, *'obh* is derived from the same Semitic verbal root from which the Arabic verb *'āba,* "to return," is derived.[4] This theory is opposed by the fact that this verbal root is not used in the older Semitic languages such as Akkadian, Ugaritic, Hebrew, Phoenician, and Aramaic. According to a third view, *'obh* is a non-Semitic cultural loanword, which is found in Sumerian (*ab,* "opening"), Akkadian (*aptu,* Neo-Assyrian *apu*), Hurrian and Hittite (*a-a-bi,* normalized *ayabi*), Ugaritic (*'ēb* < *'ayb*) and Hebrew (*'obh*), and in all these languages means *mundus,* "sacrificial pit."[5] The word is old; it was in use earlier than the second millennium B.C. It is also found in the name of the wilderness station Oboth (Nu. 21:10f.; 33:43f.), and indicates that waterholes were nearby. Albright[6] compares the Upper Mesopotamian tribal name *Ubrapi'* with the proper names found at Byblos from the early second millennium B.C., *Ibdâdî* and *Ib-addî.*[7] But because of the similar name of the male moon-god *'Ib/'Eb* in the Ugaritic texts, this suggestion must be treated with caution.[8] The divine name *Ub* can also be found in a Luwian proper name *^{m}Ú-ba-LÚ-iš;*[9] cf. other Luwian names of the type "divine name + *zitiš*" ("man of the God . . . "): *^{md}IŠTAR-LÚ, ^{m}Yarra-zitiš, ^{m}Šanta-zitiš, ^{m}Tarḫunda-zitiš.* For an example of connection with a dead ancestor in such a name, cf. *^{m}Ḫuḫḫa-zitiš.*[10]

II. The Ancient Near Eastern Background. The oldest references to *ab,* "pit," in connection with sacrifice are to be found in the Sumerian version of the Gilgamesh Epic,[11] where we learn that Gilgamesh dug a pit in the ground (*ab-làl-kur-ri gál-mu-na-ab-tag*$_4$), and out of it he called forth the spirit (*líl*) of his dead companion Enkidu. The Akkadian version[12] uses the expression *takkap erṣeti* ("hole in the ground") for such a pit, and the word *zaqīqu* for the spirit.[13]

---

[3] Nöldeke, *ZDMG,* 28 (1874), 667; Zimmern, *GGA* (1898), 817; Tur-Sinai, *EMiqr,* I, 135-37.

[4] Gesenius, *Thesaurus, s.v.;* Hitzig and König, *Offenbarungsbegriff,* 2, 150.

[5] Hoffner, 385ff.

[6] Albright, 122f., 146, n. 43.

[7] *AfO,* 19 (1959/60), 120.

[8] *UT,* 348, No. 10.

[9] *KUB,* XXII, 70, rev. 82.

[10] *KBo,* V, 7, rev. 9; ḫuḫḫa-"ancestor."

[11] BE XXI, No. 35, obv. 16f.

[12] Gilg. XII, 83f.

[13] *CAD,* XXI, 60; Hoffner, 398.

Bahan dengan hak cipta

The entire episode reminds us of 1 S. 28.[14] From the fifteenth to the end of the thirteenth centuries B.C. examples of this sort appear in the Hittite ritual.[15] In this ritual, sacrificial pits (*ḫatteššar, patteššar, a-a-bi;* Akk. *asru;* Sumerogram *TÚL, BÙR*) were dug *(kinu-, padda-)* in the ground at a place which had been determined by interrogating the gods. In this pit, oblations (loaves, cheese, butter, honey mixed with milk, oil, honey, wine, beer, and sacrificial blood), expensive gifts of silver (models of the human ear, breast ornaments, a miniature ladder), and often even the sacrificial animal, were lowered into the pit. After the sacrificial animal was lowered, someone below in the pit slaughtered it. Two of the objects lowered into the pit symbolized the twofold intention of the entire procedure. The silver model of an ear indicated the wish of the offerer to "hear" and to learn from the inhabitant of the Underworld. The silver ladder or staircase expressed the desire that the spirit might ascend to the world above. The wholly chthonic orientation of the procedure and of the accessories used is quite clear in the preference for night as the time for carrying out the ritual, for silver (instead of gold, copper, etc.) as the kind of metal to be used for the gifts, and for black sacrificial animals (especially hogs and dogs).

Of particular interest is the personification of the pit as the deity ^{D}*A-a-bi,* who is the object of a particular exorcism ritual.[16] He is the god of the Underworld, and presides there over a court of justice in which scales (Sum. *giš.rín zi.ba.na*) are used.[17] ^{D}*A-a-bi* belongs to the same class of Underworld deities as the chthonic spirit *tarpiš*.[18] It is very probable that *tarpiš* represents the same ancient migratory word as Heb. *teraphim*.[19] Thus, both *ʾobh* and *teraphim* are to be identified as mantic properties of the Underworld, in which it was thought that the source of true knowledge was to be found (→ ידעני *yidd^{e}ʿōnî*). Also the expression → רפאים *r^{e}phāʾîm,* "spirits of the dead," is connected with *ʾobh* in the second millennium B.C., if the tribal name *Ub-rapiʾ* in the Mari texts is really to be interpreted in this way. Also in the alphabetic text from ancient Ugarit a form of this ancient migratory word is found: *ʾēb* (from **ʾayb*), in combination with *ʾil* in *ʒlʒb,* "ancestral spirit."[20] Albright emends Isa. 14:19 and finds *ʾlʾb* there.[21] Again, it must be emphasized that *ʾlʾb* itself is not a monument or a stele.[22] In the expression *skn ʒlʒb,* it is *skn* which designates the monument; *ʒlʒb* is the spirit or soul of the dead who is remembered by the *skn* (monument). Also the word spelled syllabically as *il-abi*[23] should not be interpreted erroneously as "God of the father," because *abu/apu* appears commonly in later Assyrian

---

[14] Cf. Gadd, 88f.

[15] Hoffner, 385ff.; Vieyra, 47ff.

[16] *KUB,* VII, 41; *ZA,* 54 (1961), 131f.; ^{D}*A-a-bi* also occurs in *KUB,* X, 63, I, 18, 20, 24, 26; XXXIV, 96, 6; XXIV, 49, III, 31; *KBo,* X, 45; II, 19; III, 22; Bo 2072, III, 13, 16, 19.

[17] *KUB,* VII, 41, III, 19f.

[18] See H. Hoffner, *JNES,* 27 (1968), 61-68; with regard to the Babylonian *šēdu* as "external soul," cf. A. L. Oppenheim, *Ancient Mesopotamia* (1964), 198-201.

[19] See Hoffner, *loc. cit.*

[20] *UT,* 358, No. 165; Hoffner, *JBL,* 386f.; Astour, *JAOS,* 86 (1966), 279, 281.

[21] Albright, 141, n. 80.

[22] Cf. Hoffner, *JBL,* 387.

[23] Astour, 279, n. 25.

Copyrighted material

texts as a word for the pit in the ground.[24] That this deity is known both as *ʒb* and as *ʒlʒb* corresponds exactly with the two ways of writing a divine name in Hittite texts: ^{D}*Kunirša* (Canaanite *qn ʾrṣ*) and ^{D}*Elkunirša* (Canaanite *ʾl qn ʾrṣ*).[25]

III. Use in the OT. The OT uses this expression in three different senses: (1) the pit which has been digged out, by means of which the spirits of the dead are called up (1 S. 28:7f.); (2) the spirit or spirits of the dead which are troubled (Isa. 29:4);[26] and (3) the necromancer who calls forth the spirits to get information (Lev. 19:31; 20:6,27; Dt. 18:11; 1 S. 28:3,9; 2 K. 21:6 [=2 Ch. 33:6]; 23:24; Isa. 8:19). The OT does not describe how the pit was prepared. But this is no objection to this interpretation. The spirit ascends (*ʿalah,* 1 S. 28:8,11,13f.) from the ground and undoubtedly comes forth from a prepared opening. Although the language of Isa. 29:4 is perhaps somewhat figurative, still in the scornful words found there we can get some impression of the way in which the spirits were called: "Then deep from the earth you shall speak, from low in the dust your words shall come; your voice shall come from the ground like the voice of a ghost, and your speech shall whisper out of the dust." The prophets of Yahweh describe the audible manifestations of the *ʾobh* as "whispering" or "chirping" (*tsaphtseph*), an expression which denotes the cry of certain birds (Isa. 10:14) or the rustling of the leaves of the willow tree (cf. the name of a tree *tsaphtsaphah,* Ezk. 17:5). The different verbs connected with *ʾobh* indicate only that here was the source of secret information: a person "turned to" (*tiphnu ʾel,* Lev. 19:31), "sought" (*darash ʾel,* Isa. 8:19; *darash be,* 1 S. 28:7), "used" (*ʿasah*) or "consulted" (*shaʾal be,* 1 Ch. 10:13) the necromancer, who asked advice of (*shaʾal ʾel,* Dt. 18:11) the spirit or spirits who came up out of the pit, or "divined by" (*qasam be,* 1 S. 28:8) them.

1 S. 28 is the most fruitful and probably also the oldest witness in the OT for the understanding of *ʾobh.* In this passage we learn that the crisis which gave rise to the consultation of the necromancer was a serious military threat (vv. 4f.). Naturally, the approved ways of seeking advice (*nebhiʾim,* "prophets"; *ʾurim,* "Urim"; *chalomoth,* "dreams") were exhausted first, but Yahweh did not answer (*ʿanah,* v. 6). When this happened, out of desperation Saul commanded his officers to seek out for him a woman who had access to an *ʾobh.* Saul went to her at night partly to conceal his identity, and partly because necromancers of this sort preferred to do their work at night.[27] He made a twofold request: (1) "Divine *(qasam)* for me by a spirit *(ʾobh),*" and (2) "Bring up for me *(haʿali)* whomever I shall name to you" (v. 8). After the woman had obtained a promise of protection from her client (v. 10), the name of the dead person who should be brought up was given to her (v. 11). This passage gives no information as to the procedure the woman used to entice the spirit of Samuel to come forth. When it appeared, she alone had a visionary experience (vv. 12f.), because Saul had to ask her:

---

[24] *CAD,* I/2, 201a.
[25] Otten, *MIO,* 1 (1953), 125ff.; Hoffner, *RHA,* 76 (1965), 5ff.
[26] Robertson-Smith, *JoPh,* 14, 127f.
[27] See above, II.

Copyrighted material

"What do you see?" This visionary experience gave the woman greater potential for comprehension, for suddenly she knew the true identity of her disguised client (v. 12). She described that which appeared to her in the vision as "spirits (→ אלהים *ʾelōhîm*, "gods") coming up out of the (opening in the) earth" (v. 13), and as "an old man *(ʾish zaqen)* . . . , who is wrapped in a robe *(meʿil)*" (v. 14). The account of Saul's nocturnal visit to the *baʿalath ʾobh* is told in artistic literary style. But still there can be no doubt that this document accurately reflects the practice of necromancy in ancient Israel.

Schmidtke compares the *ʾobh* with Bab. *eṭemmu*, "spirit of the dead," and gives a somewhat different explanation. He alludes to the calling forth of Enkidu by Gilgamesh and emphasizes the role of the Babylon spirits of the dead in the giving of oracles.

Hoffner

אָוָה *ʾāvāh;* אַוָּה (הַוָּה) *ʾavvāh (havvāh);* תַּאֲוָה *taʾᵃvāh;* מַאֲוַיִּים *maʾᵃviyyîm*

Contents: I. 1. Etymology, Occurrences; 2. Meaning. II. Secular Use: 1. General; 2. The Wisdom Literature; 3. Formula of Authority. III. Religious Meanings: 1. God's Desire; 2. The Doctrine of Retribution; 3. The Tenth Commandment; 4. In J.

I. 1. *Etymology, Occurrences.* It is clear that the root *ʾvh* belongs only to West Semitic languages. Outside of Hebrew, it is found in Arabic (*ʾawā*), Jewish Aramaic *(ʾvy)*, Syriac *(ʾwā)*, and Mandean (*awa* I). Palache takes as his starting-point the meaning "to agree," [1] but the only support for this is the peal participle in Syriac. All other extant forms can be connected with two spheres of meaning: (a) "to devote oneself to," (b) "to stay, dwell." [2] The verb appears in the piel and hithpael. In addition, Palache interprets *naʾavah* and *naʾvu* in Isa. 52:7; Cant. 1:10; Ps. 93:5, as the *niphal* of *ʾavah*. [3] The substantives *taʾavah* (cf. also the place name Kibroth-hattaavah, Nu. 11:34f.; 33:16f.; Dt. 9:22), *ʾavvah,* and

---

ʾāvāh. F. Büchsel, "ἐπιθυμία, ἐπιθυμέω," *TDNT*, III, 168-172; J. Herrmann, "Das zehnte Gebot," *Festschrift E. Sellin* (1927), 69-82; E. Nielsen, *The Ten Commandments in New Perspective* (trans. 1965); J. L. Palache, *Semantic Notes on the Hebrew Lexicon* (Leiden, 1959); J. Reider, "Etymological Studies in Biblical Hebrew," *VT*, 2 (1952), 113-130; H. Graf Reventlow, *Gebot und Predigt im Dekalog* (1962); J. J. Stamm with M. E. Andrew, *The Ten Commandments in Recent Research* (trans. 1967).

1 Palache, 2.
2 Cf. Lane and Blachère-Chouémi; Brockelmann, *LexSyr; MdD*.
3 Palache, 2; so also *KBL*.

Copyrighted material

ma'aviyyim are derived from *'avah*. The substantive *havvah* (Mic. 7:3; Prov. 10:3; 11:6), which cannot be separated from *'avah* semantically, perhaps also belongs to this group. On the interchangeability of *aleph* and *he*, cf. *'ekh* and *hekh*. Of course, an etymological connection of *havvah* with Arab. *hawiya*, "to love," cannot be rejected. Cf. also Arab. *'wy*, "to give up to, renounce." [4] In Hos. 10:10, *ba'thi*, "I have (will) come," is to be read instead of *be'avvathi*, "in my desire"; [5] and in Prov. 18:1, *to'anah*, "pretext(s)," is to be read instead of *ta'avah*, "desire." [6]

2. *Meaning*. *'avah* is synonymous with *chamadh*, "to desire." This is supported by more than simply the parallelism in Gen. 3:6. Even more convincing are Prov. 6:25 and Ps. 68:17 (Eng. v. 16), where *chamadh* appears in the same connection as *'avah* does in Ps. 45:12(11) and 132:13f. Also the linguistic usage of the Tannaites, who use these two verbs in parallelism (*Aboth* vi.5), seems to lead to the conclusion that these two ideas were understood as synonyms. The meaning "to desire" is not exhausted by a mere regulation of the will. The aspiration is rooted deep in human existence. Apart from Ps. 132:13f., *'avah* in the piel is always connected with *nephesh*, "soul," as its subject: *'avvah* and *havvah* also appear only in connection with *nephesh*. *ta'avah* is used in connection with *nephesh* (Isa. 26:8; Ps. 10:3), *lebh*, "heart" (Ps. 21:3[2]), and *'adham*, "man" (Prov. 19:22). The ascription of "desire" to God (Ps. 132:13f.; Job 23:13) and to an animal (Jer. 2:24) is figurative language. In Gen. 49:26; Nu. 34:7f.,10, *ta'avah* and *'avah* (or *ta'ah*) mean "residence" and "to reside" respectively. [7]

II. Secular Use.

1. *General*. Just as desire belongs to human existence, so also does its goal: it is directed toward fundamental necessities, such as eating (Mic. 7:1; Job 33:20) and drinking (2 S. 23:15 = 1 Ch. 11:17), and toward the opposite sex (Ps. 45:12 [11]; cf. Jer. 2:24).

2. *The Wisdom Literature*. The connection between human existence and the aspiration designated by the word *'avah* (a connection suggested by the language itself) is described in an instructive way in the Wisdom Literature. Fulfilled desire increases self-confidence (Prov. 13:12,19; 19:22), while a man who has everything he desires, but cannot enjoy it, has an empty life (Eccl. 6:2). The Wisdom Literature warns against a desire which would lead one to injure himself (Prov. 23:3,6; 24:1). The principle of retribution depends on the success or failure of the personal quality of the desire (Prov. 13:4; 21:25f.).

3. *Formula of Authority*. While Micah laments that the mighty do and permit what they desire (7:3), in the Deuteronomistic material it is clear that no

---

4 *KBL*³.
5 See *BHK*.
6 *BHK*.
7 Reider, 113.

Material chroniony prawem autorskim

real limits are placed by law on the office of the king in the execution of his purposes. The reference to the unlimited power of the king is an important element in the formula which was used when the authority of the kingship was offered to a man (2 S. 3:21; 1 K. 11:37). When the royal court offers to serve the king, it uses the ceremonial formula, "according to all your heart's desire" (1 S. 23:20). This formal use of *'avvah* and *'ivvah* appears in those portions of Deuteronomy which deal with centralization of the cult, and always in connection with an appeal to the individual to take advantage of his freedom to choose life (Dt. 12:13-19, 20-28; 14:22-27; 18:1-8). There is a reminiscence of this usage in 1 S. 2:16.

III. Religious Meanings.

1. *God's Desire.* When God is the subject of *'ivvah,* this verb is in parallelism with *bachar,* "to choose" (Ps. 132:13f.; Job 23:13, where *bachar* is to be read instead of *be'echadh,* "in one," cf. *BHK*). Consequently, this word describes God's all-encompassing freedom of choice, not in the sense that it is open to him as a possibility, but that he actually claims it for himself.

2. *The Doctrine of Retribution.* The transition from secular to religious usage may be best observed in the doctrine of retribution; however, in the OT the antonyms "lazy" and "industrious" are replaced by "the righteous" and "the wicked" (Prov. 10:24; 11:23; Ps. 112:10). The words used in petitions and laments are typical of the doctrine of retribution. The evil which the wicked desires (Prov. 21:10) is the downfall of the righteous (Ps. 140:9[8]). On the other hand, the desire of the meek is dependent on God's help (10:17), which does justice (10:18; 140:13[12]; Isa. 26:8f.). It is in the mouth of the righteous that *ta'avah* assumes the meaning "supplication," which is characterized by the "certainty of hearing" on the part of the righteous (Ps. 10:17; 38:16[15]; 140:13 [12]; cf. 21:3[2]). Help comes on a specific day, for which the person in distress yearns in prayer (Isa. 26:8f.; Jer. 17:16; Am. 5:18). But of course, God's intervention can overturn prevailing standards (Am. 5:18-20).

3. *The Tenth Commandment.* It follows from what has already been said that the Deuteronomic expansion of the Decalog (Dt. 5:21[18]) is to be understood neither as a "watering down" [8] nor as a spiritualization. Rather, it is the result of the Deuteronomist's appropriation of the Decalog, the result of preaching. [9] The formal relationship between *velo thith'avvah beth re'akha,* "and you shall not desire your neighbor's house" (Dt. 5:21[18]), and *'al tith'av lemat'ammothav,* "do not desire his delicacies" (Prov. 23:3,6), is due presumably to the influence of Wisdom, especially since it has didactic interests and preference for the root *'vh* in common with Deuteronomy. If this conjecture is

---

[8] Nielsen, 42.
[9] Reventlow, 87. Cf. Stamm-Andrew, 107ff.

Material chroniony prawem autorskim

in Ethiopic,[5] surmises that the Ethiopic was infiltrated by the biblical language. In Biblical Hebrew, an adjective *'evili* (Zec. 11:15) is derived from *'evil;* however, *'evil* is actually a substantive and sometimes is used in the plural, but never in the feminine. *'ivveleth,* which exhibits the rather rare *qitteleth* form,[6] is also derived from *'evil.* This word is used to describe defects of the body and of the spirit,[7] and assumes a root *'vl.* However, it is hardly possible to connect this root with Aram. *'vlt,* "slave" (*CIS,* II, 64, 1), since the latter comes from Akk. *awē-lū(tu);*[8] cf. Evil-merodach (for Awēl Marduk, "man of Marduk") in 2 K. 25:27, which is written in Hebrew with anti-Babylonian vocalization. *'evil* is connected with *kesil,* "fool," in the OT, indicating a great similarity in meaning; *'ivveleth* is a characteristic of the *kesil* (Prov. 12:23; 26:5; etc.).

The first OT passage using *'evil* that can be dated with certainty is Hos. 9:7. Thus this word is not part of the earlier elements of the Hebrew language. Its frequent occurrence in the oldest collections of proverbs (in Prov. 10–22 *'evil* is found 12 times and *'ivveleth* 16 times; in Prov. 25–29 *'evil* appears twice and *'ivveleth* 4 times) leads to the assumption that this word was being used in circles of Wisdom teachers before the prophets started using it.

The related root *ya'al,* which occurs only in the niphal and means "to behave foolishly," "to prove oneself to be a fool," points to earlier occurrences. Nu. 12:11, where it is used in connection with *chata'*, "to sin," is probably from E. In Isa. 19:13, it stands in parallelism with *nasha'*, "to be deluded," and is connected with *hith'ah,* "to lead astray." Jer. 5:4 says that the poor *(dal)* are foolish because they do not know the way of the Lord. Further examples appear in Jer. 50:36 and Sir. 47:23.

II. Occurrences in Prebiblical Wisdom Literature. The old collections in Prov. 10–22 and 25–29 imply a connection between a "fool" and unfruitful speech *('evil* in Prov. 10:8,14,21; 12:16; 14:3,9; 17:28; 20:3; 24:7; 29:9; *'ivveleth* in 12:23; 13:16; 15:2,14; 24:9). In Egyptian Wisdom Literature extending from Ptahhotep (e.g., lines 37, 148, 152) through Ani (VII, 7) and especially Amenemope (whose only goal was to learn the correct answer to a speech, cf. Prov. 18:13), down to Ankhsheshonk (e.g., 8, 3), the common themes are self-control in speech and praise of silence. Accordingly Prov. 17:28 is clear: "Even an *'evil* who keeps silent is considered wise." The fool of Prov. 14:29 and 17:12 is quick-tempered, just as in Amenemope. Babylonian Wisdom Literature gives similar advice.[9]

None of these extrabiblical texts has an exact equivalent to the OT *'evil.* However, Prov. 10:8 may help us here, because Isa. 19:11 states that "the princes of Zoan are utterly foolish *('evilim).*" Prov. 10:8 speaks of the one who is "*'evil* (a fool, foolish) of lips," a compound expression of the Egyptian type, in which

---

5 Leslau, *Contributions,* 10.
6 *GK,* § 84a,o; *BLe,* 477z.
7 *GK,* § 84b,c,d.
8 Baumgartner, *BiOr,* 19 (1962), 134.
9 W. Lambert, *BWL,* 99, 101, in order to avoid strife; p. 105, lines 127-134.

Materiał chroniony prawem autorskim

deceptive cultic or political propaganda, and which the severe prophetic criticism (at first in part generalized) considered to be ultimately wickedness against Yahweh. In this connection, it is important to observe that the doers of *ʾaven* use this word mainly as a means of carrying out their plans.

The prophetic texts express the firm conviction that deeds of *ʾaven* against Yahweh's will are always futile, "empty," even if the main harm they do lies in the realm of human relations. The divine punishment follows unconditionally. As early as Am. 5:5 we encounter the thought that Yahweh's judgment also brings *ʾaven* on the evildoer now. This aspect is expressed more clearly in the essentially later text Jer. 4:14f. Here *ʾaven* is used as a comprehensive term for the crimes which Jerusalem had committed against Yahweh; but it also refers to the punishment God was about to bring upon Judah in the form of a military invasion from the north.

2. *Later Use Outside the Psalter.* In prophetic and sapiential texts that originated at a later time, in the main this framework is not exceeded, and yet we must not fail to recognize a growing tendency to generalize. Antisocial behavior, especially injustice in legal affairs, is called *ʾaven* in Isa. 58:9; 59:4; Ezk. 11:2; Prov. 17:4f.; 19:28; 21:15; and perhaps also in Job 34:22 (note the context) and Prov. 6:18. In the later prophetic criticism of the cult, *ʾaven* is generally used to characterize the sacrificial cult as lying and deceit (1 S. 15:22f.; Isa. 1:13; 66:3), referring to illegitimate cult practices which mediate false instruction (Zec. 10:2) or are otherwise detrimental (Isa. 32:6; cf. Prov. 6:18; "pointing the finger" in Isa. 58:9 and Prov. 6:12f. is probably not to be interpreted as a magical act).[7] As in the earlier texts, in the exilic period *ʾaven* is also used to characterize the opponent of the politico-historical will of Yahweh proclaimed by the prophets (Isa. 41:29). A particular theme of the Wisdom Literature is that Yahweh's punishment is an inevitable consequence for all who have committed *ʾaven* in any respect (Job 21:19; 31:3). The *poʿale ʾaven* cannot hide themselves from God (11:11; 34:22); suddenly they will be destroyed (Prov. 6:12-15). Anyone who practices deeds of *ʾaven* will reap what he has sown (Job 4:8). Conversely, he who obviously is not "righteous" must suffer *ʾaven* (understood as Yahweh's punishment, Prov. 12:21; 30:20). Therefore, the Wisdom Literature does not lack admonitions to avoid everything which is reproved by Yahweh as *ʾaven*, and which could be punished with *ʾaven* (Job 34:8; 36:10). Only the prophetic statements in Isa. 55:7; 58:9; and 59:4ff. speak of a possible conversion of the doers of *ʾaven*, viewed in an eschatological frame of thought. Here, of course, what is at stake is not an individual evildoer or a group, but the people of God as a whole.

3. *ʾaven and poʿale ʾaven in the Psalter.* The use of *ʾaven* or *poʿale ʾaven* in the postexilic hymns and didactic poems of the Psalter does not differ from

---

[7] Cf. G. Fohrer, *Jesaja*, III (1964), 211.

Bahan dengan hak cipta

the use of these terms in the Wisdom Literature. Thus, in general Ps. 92 deals with the fate of certain evildoers who must perish as Yahweh's enemies, in comparison with the secure existence of the righteous. Similar connections may be found in Ps. 66:18; 119:133; and 125:5, to some extent in connection with moral admonitions. (According to the preexilic Ps. 101:8, it is the king's responsibility to destroy the *poʿale ʾaven*.) Finally, Ps. 90:10 sees in *ʾaven* the ultimately vain toil of life, determined by God for man in general.

A specialized use of *ʾaven,* which seems to stand out in bold relief from its linguistic use elsewhere, appears in certain Individual Psalms of Lament, in which the enemies of the worshipper are characterized as *poʿale ʾaven* (Pss. 5, 28, 36, 59, 64, 94, 141; in 59:6[5] as *boghedhe ʾaven,* "those who treacherously plot iniquity"). We also encounter this designation in earlier prophetic texts (Isa. 31:2; Hos. 6:8); but in the psalms mentioned here the corrupting work of the *poʿale ʾaven* is described more precisely: as a rule in these passages the evildoers appear in groups. They band together, scheme together, and boast together (Ps. 59:4[3]; 64:3[2]; 94:4). They prowl through the streets and howl in the evening twilight in a sinister way like hungry dogs (59:7, 15f. [6, 14f.]). They attempt to kill the righteous worshipper (59:4[3]; 94:21). They are also described as mischief-makers, who devise their plots in seclusion on their beds (36:5[4]), hide carefully (64:7[6]) and use friendly words, but have mischief in their hearts (28:3; cf. also the Royal Song, 101:4). From ambush they suddenly shoot their poisonous words at the godly like an arrow (64:4[3]). Usually words are the weapons which they use. They whet their tongues like a sword (64:4[3]); their throat is compared with an open sepulchre (5:10[9]). They speak lying words (5:6f.[5f.]; 36:4f.[3f.]; 59:13[12]; cf. 101:5-7) and slanders (59:8[7]). Since the deeds of these enemies are directed against the godly, they are also enemies of Yahweh (59:6[5]). Inevitably the punishment of divine judgment will come upon them (94:16f.,23), often with the same weapons which they use against the godly (64:8[7]). They fall into the very nets which they themselves made (141:10).

To be sure, this reaction of Yahweh to the works of the *poʿale ʾaven* in the Individual Psalms of Lament is identical to the descriptions of the divine punishment of the doers of *ʾaven* in prophetic and sapiential texts. Accordingly, Ps. 14:4 and 53:5(4) do not have in mind some sort of mysterious enemies who wish to destroy the godly with curses or lies, but here the *poʿale ʾaven* (as often in the prophetic tradition) are people who harm innocent persons in precarious situations for their own advantage. Also, some of the psalms which have typical descriptions of enemies reveal that a specific social stratum or professional group is intended, as was the case with the use of *ʾaven* by the earlier prophets. Thus, the *poʿale ʾaven* in Ps. 94 belong to the body of judges, who oppress the widow, the orphan, and the sojourner, and pervert the right of the poor.

But there are also similarities between the special description of the *poʿale ʾaven* as malicious enemies of the worshipper in the Individual Psalms of Lament and the use of *ʾaven* in the prophetic tradition. The motif of evildoers devising devices of *ʾaven* on their beds at night and performing their evil plans early in the morning is already found in Mic. 2:1; the same motif appears in Jer. 4:14 and especially in exilic and postexilic texts (Isa. 59:7; Ezk. 11:2; and also Isa.

Bahan dengan hak cipta

32:6; 55:7).[8] The motif of waiting in ambush (Isa. 29:20) and of mischievous speech (Isa. 58:9; 59:4) also appears; indeed, the examples in the earlier prophets assume that the doer of *ʾaven* uses words in order to carry out his evil.[9]

Thus, the use of *ʾaven* or of *poʿale ʾaven* in the Individual Psalms of Lament does not differ fundamentally from the use of these terms outside the Psalter. Also, it is clear that in the Individual Psalms of Lament the *poʿale ʾaven* are not a homogeneous group in Israelite society. Therefore, the interpretation that identifies them specifically as "sorcerers" who use magical means to achieve their evil objectives[10] is feasible only in some cases.

In an attempt to define *poʿale ʾaven* more precisely, the following points should also be taken into consideration. (a) The typical description of the works of the enemies of the worshipper outlined above is by no means always connected with the application of the term *poʿale ʾaven* to the person doing these works. To be sure, there are some individual laments that speak of deeds that qualify as *ʾaven*, but those who perform these deeds are called → רשע *rāshāʿ*, "wicked" (Pss. 7, 10, 55), → אויב *ʾôyēbh*, "enemy" (Pss. 7, 41, 55), → צורר *tsôrēr*, "vexer, adversary, enemy" (Ps. 7), or → רע *rāʿ*, "evildoer" (Ps. 10). The appearance of these enemies who are not called *poʿale ʾaven* is characterized wholly as *poʿale ʾaven:* they roam about in groups (55:4,11f.[3,10f.]), do evil by means of speaking, cursing, and lying (10:7; 41:6,8[5,7]; 55:22[21]), and pretend deceitfully that they are intimate friends of the worshipper (41:10[9]; 55:13f., 21ff.[12f., 20ff.]).

(b) The majority of the Individual Psalms of Lament that contain descriptions of the enemies (29 out of 40) mention neither the *poʿale ʾaven* nor *ʾaven*. But to some extent these psalms contain essentially more detailed and more extensive descriptions of the works of the enemies than the eleven psalms that actually use *ʾaven* (cf. esp. Pss. 31, 35, 37, 69, 73, 109, 140). Thus, there is no reason to assume that the picture of the enemy who waits in ambush, curses, slanders, and usually appears in a group has an especially close connection with the idea of *poʿale ʾaven*.

These observations show that the *poʿale ʾaven* are not one group among the enemies in the Individual Psalms of Lament which can be narrowly defined. A closer analysis of the way they are described indicates that they cannot be distinguished from the *ʾoyebhim*, the *mereʿim*, the *reshaʿim*, and other enemies which have been designated in these psalms, which to some extent also appear outside the Psalter as parallels to *poʿale ʾaven* (cf. Isa. 31:2; 55:7; etc.). Because of this, scholars have also tried to interpret the enemies in the Individual Psalms of Lament (along with the ideas used to designate these enemies) collectively and homogeneously as the essence of complete "evil power,"[11] specifically as sorcerers and demons,[12] as foreign enemies of the king,[13] or as personal opponents

---

[8] V. Maag, *Text, Wortschatz und Begriffswelt des Buches Amos* (1951), 64, finds the "sinister, horrifying" aspect of *ʾaven* expressed already in Am. 5:5.

[9] Cf. above, III.1(c).

[10] Mowinckel, *Psalmenstudien,* I; Nicolsky, Pedersen.

[11] Mowinckel, *Religion,* 26.

[12] Mowinckel, *Psalmenstudien,* I, 121; "Fiendene," 3; G. Widengren, *The Accadian and Hebrew Psalms of Lamentation* (1936), 197ff.

[13] Birkeland.

Bahan dengan hak cipta

I. 1. *Etymology, Occurrences, Synonyms.* The Hebrew root *ʾwr* (substantive and verb) corresponds to Ugar. *ʾr,* "to be bright, to illumine," and Akk. *urru,* "day." There is a rare cognate form of *ʾwr,* the substantive *ʾorah* (Ps. 139:12 [Eng. v. 11]), pl. *ʾoroth* (Isa. 26:19). *maʾor,* pls. *meʾorim* and *meʾoroth,* "light-bearer, lamp, light," is a derivative of *ʾwr.* When it is pronounced *ʾur* in the OT, *ʾwr* means "fire"; accordingly, the verb in the hiphil can have the meaning "to kindle, set on fire." Originally the fire of the hearth was also the source of light.

In the OT, the verb appears in the qal and niphal only rarely, but in the hiphil it occurs more frequently, in all about 45 times. The basic meaning is "to be bright," in the hiphil "to disseminate light, illuminate." The substantive *ʾor* appears about 150 times and means "brightness, brilliance, daylight." *maʾor* occurs about 20 times, usually with the meaning "lamp," and occasionally "light."

The Hebrew root → נור *nûr* is closely related to *ʾwr.* In the OT it is represented by the derivative *nir/ner,* "lamp," and *menorah,* "lampstand." It corresponds to Ugar. *nyr/nr,* "to illumine, light, lamp";[1] cf. Akk. *nūru,* "light."[2] From the Aramaic root *nhr,* the verb *nahar,* "to shine," and the substantive *neharah,* "daylight," are found occasionally in the Hebrew OT, while *nehor/nehir,* "light," and *nahiru,* "illumination," appear in the Aramaic parts of the OT. Other important synonyms of *ʾwr* treated in the present article are → נגה *nāghah,* "to shine," *noghah,* "brightness," and יפע *yāphaʿ* in the hiphil, "to shine forth, shine out." *shachar,* "dawn," is also important for this study. Cf. also → חשך *chōshekh,* "darkness"; → יום *yôm,* "day"; → הלל *hālal,* "to shine"; → זהר *zāhar,* "to be light, shining"; → שמש *shemesh,* "sun"; → ירח *yarēach,* "moon"; and → כוכב *kôkhābh,* "star."

ʾôr. S. Aalen, *Die Begriffe 'Licht' und 'Finsternis' im AT, im Spätjudentum und im Rabbinismus. SNVAO* (1951); F. Asensio, *El Dios de la Luz* (1958); R. Bultmann, *Zur Geschichte der Lichtsymbolik im Altertum* (1948) = *Exegetica* (1967), 323-355; C. Colpe, "Lichtsymbolik im alten Iran und antiken Judentum," *StudGen,* 18 (1965), 116-133; A. M. Gierlich, *Der Lichtgedanke in den Psalmen. FreibThSt,* 56 (1940); J. Hempel, "Die Lichtsymbolik im AT," *StudGen,* 13 (1960), 352-368; E. Hornung, "Licht und Finsternis in der Vorstellungswelt Altägyptens," *StudGen,* 18 (1965), 73-83; P. Humbert, "Le thème vétérotestamentaire de la lumière," *RTP,* 99 (1966), 1-6; L. Koehler, "Die Morgenröte im AT," *ZAW,* 44 (1926), 56-59; S. N. Kramer, *The Sumerians, Their History, Culture, and Character* (1963); H. Lesètre, "Lumière," *DB,* IV (1908), 415ff.; H. G. May, "Some Aspects of Solar Worship at Jerusalem," *ZAW,* 55 (1937), 269-281; *idem,* "The Creation of Light in Gen. 1,3-5," *JBL,* 58 (1939), 203-211; G. Nagel, "Le culte du soleil dans l'ancienne Egypte," *ErJb,* 10 (1943), 9-55, other articles also appear here; Fr. Nötscher, *"Das Angesicht Gottes schauen" nach bibl. und babylon. Auffassung* (1924); *idem, Zur theol. Terminologie der Qumran-Texte. BBB,* 10 (1956), 92-148; A. Oepke, "λάμπω," *TDNT,* IV, 17-28; H. Ringgren, "Light and Darkness in Ancient Egyptian Religion," *Liber Amicorum. Festschrift C. J. Bleeker* (1969), 140-150; W. H. Schmidt, *Die Schöpfungsgeschichte der Priesterschrift, WMANT,* 17 (²1967); W. von Soden, "Licht und Finsternis in der sumer. und babylon. Religion," *StudGen,* 13 (1960), 647-653; P. Wernberg-Møller, "A Reconsideration of the Two Spirits in the Rule of the Community," *RevQ,* 3 (1961/62), 413-441.

[1] *WUS,* 214.
[2] *AHw,* 805.

Material com direitos autorais

2. *Religio-Historical Background.* (a) In the Ugaritic texts, the concepts of light and darkness do not play an important role. There the emphasis is on the fertility cult and the changes in the seasons. Dawn and Dusk are the first sons of the creator-god, and consequently the alternation of day and night is a primitive date for the creation of the world. The sun is less important than the moon, the "luminary of heaven." The moon is connected with the fertility of the ground. Light is associated with dew and rain, and is perhaps thought of as a consort of the god of the atmosphere.[3] The sun's function is to uncover or expose; it is the "luminary" of the gods and the witness of truth. The scorching summer sun is typical for the dry season and is connected with the god of the Underworld. The expression *pn špš nr by,*[4] "the countenance of the sun shines upon me" = "I enjoy the favor of the (Hittite) king," is of special interest.[5]

The astral deities also have a subordinate role among the Sumerians. The main gods are the gods of the atmosphere, of heaven, of the underground ocean, and the goddess of the earth. The bright-eyed god of the air, father of the gods and creator-god, separated heaven and earth in creation. He causes the day to appear.[6] His light "rises up," he "makes his emblems bright."[7] Thus, outside the group of astral gods, the god of the air has connections with light, and is above the astral gods in rank. As father of the sun-god, the moon-god, son of the god of the air, has preeminence over the sun-god. The moon is the greatest of the heavenly lights. His light represents wisdom. The sun-god is the one who exposes man's deeds, the judge who is responsible for the moral order of the world. The gods live in the bright and blessed land where the sun rises. As an example of the figurative use of light and darkness, we may cite the following: "my god, the day shines brightly over the land, for me the day is dark."[8]

Among the Babylonians the picture is different in essential points. Marduk ("calf of the sun, child of the sun"), originally a god of the spring sun, has taken the place of the Sumerian god of the air in the pantheon, and as a result the triangular scheme of the ancient nature religion (heaven, atmosphere, earth or the deep) falls apart and is replaced by the astral deities, especially by the triad sun, moon, and Venus. Through their orbits, these deities regulate fate and history. It is now understood that the sun sheds light upon the world, makes the days shorter and the nights longer, and regulates the seasons. Its importance is extensive. The sun-god is overseer of the cosmos, and thus protector of law and patron of the weak, and is connected with didactic and moral characteristics. Naturally, the light of the astral gods is mentioned often. The ruler of the dark Underworld is Nergal, who is responsible for the horrors of fever, pestilence, and death, but who is also interpreted as a representative of the scorching midday sun. Demons wreak havoc during the night. There is no dualism between light

---

3 *WUS.*
4 *UT,* 1015, 9f.
5 Cf. *CRAI* (1952), 232.
6 Kramer, 119.
7 Von Soden, 648.
8 Man and His God, 68; *ANET Suppl.,* 154.

Material com direitos autorais

and darkness in the Babylonian view of the creation of the world. A darkening of the stars is an indication of a time of curse.

In the Egyptian religion, the sun gained an important position very early. The first gods came out of primitive water. The egg out of which the sun (and thus light) emerges is hatched by the eight primitive deities, two of which are personifications of darkness (Hermopolis). The identification of the sun-god Rēʿ with the primitive god Atum (Heliopolis) is perhaps secondary. In Heliopolis there was a cosmogony, according to which the sun was brought forth by the goddess of heaven, whose husband was the earth. Besides these two gods there is the god of the air, who in the creation separates earth and heaven from each other. Thus, here air, earth, and the firmament form a stage between primitive water/primitive god and sun. This little monistic concept, which is very close to an empirical observation, is very ancient, and we can see in it a "pre-solar" religious scheme similar to that which we found among the Sumerians.

With the increasing significance of the sun, among the Egyptians the sun-god becomes the creator, and is the origin of all life and well-being. Life is a gift of the sun. Light and life belong together. When the sun goes down, men "die" as it were, they sleep like the dead. But the night, which also belongs to the world of creation and is an emanation of primitive darkness, also conceals renewing powers within it. Each sunrise is a repetition of the creation of the world, but in a very particular way on the morning of the New Year's Day. The sun determines the seasons; a solar calendar is well known. The power of the sun extends to the realm of knowledge and to the moral and political order of the world. There is a dualistic motif in the idea of the matutinal battle of the sun-god with the serpent Apophis, which probably personifies the darkness of night. However, primitive water and primitive darkness are not represented as opponents of the creation of the world. The darkening of the sun and of the earth are mythical figures for political revolution and interregnum. The Egyptians also use the concepts of light and darkness figuratively: "The sun of him that knew thee not hath set, O Amūn. But he that knoweth thee, he shineth. The forecourt of him that assailed thee is in darkness, while the whole earth is in sunlight." [9]

(b) The religio-historical background of the OT concept of light is to be sought in the "pre-solar" stage, which may be seen in the Ugaritic texts, among the Sumerians, and in an ancient stratum of the Egyptian religion (cf. also the Babylonian account of creation from Berossos). The subordinate role of the heavenly bodies and presumably a combination of the cosmic light with the air is characteristic of this scheme. Light is primarily daylight. A further characteristic is the superiority of the moon over the sun. This scheme is helpful in illuminating important aspects of the OT concept of light, e.g., the sequence of the creation of the world in Gen. 1, the inferior evaluation of the sun in comparison with the moon, and the predominant role of the day-night complex (in contradistinction to the solar year) in the Israelite consciousness of time and in the metaphorical use of light.

---

[9] Erman, *Literature of the Ancient Egyptians* (trans. 1927), 310.

Material com direitos autorais

25:34,36; 29:10; 2 S. 17:22; 2 K. 7:9; Isa. 58:8; Hos. 6:3,5; Am. 5:20; Mic. 2:1; Zeph. 3:5; Zec. 14:6f.; Ps. 139:11f.; Job 3:3-8 [v. 4: *neharah*]; 17:12; 38:19; Neh. 8:3). Sometimes it is possible to observe an explicit or a supposed distinction between the light of the day and the light of the sun. In Isa. 30:26, the light of the sun is compared with the light of the day. In Eccl. 12:2, *ʾor,* probably meaning daylight, stands alongside the sun, the moon, and the stars. In 2 S. 23:4, the rising sun and the "morning light" are named side by side (cf. also Am. 8:9).[20]

b. *Dawn.* This whole concept is confirmed by an investigation of the process of daybreak. The dawn (→ שחר *shachar,* which traditionally, but erroneously, is rendered "sunrise") appears a good hour before sunrise in Palestine. Even earlier, about $1^1/_2$ to 2 hours before sunrise, a faint gleam may be seen on the eastern horizon, and gradually this grows into a light which sweeps over the whole horizon. This swath of light is the *shachar,* "the dawn."[21] This idea is in harmony with the practice of comparing the dawn with eyelids (Job 3:9; cf. 41:10 [18]) or with wings (Ps. 139:9). The idea lying behind *shachar,* "dawn," is that of still distant light (Ps. 139:9), of light looking forth (Cant. 6:10) as out of an eye (Job 3:9; 41:10 [18]; Cant. 6:10) or coming out of a crevice (Isa. 58:8). Furthermore, the phenomenon of gradually becoming brighter (Prov. 4:18), from a state of darkness (Joel 2:2) to a complete "establishment" of light (Hos. 6:3,5), is characteristic of the *shachar,* "dawn." Still, twilight (which assumes the dawn), or better dusk, *nesheph* (1 S. 30:17; 2 K. 7:5,7; Job 7:4; Ps. 119:147), when the stars can still be seen (Job 3:9; 38:7), belongs to the night. While the dawn is causing the stars to disappear, only the morning star, Venus, remains visible (Isa. 14:12).

It is clear from Job 38:12-15 that the morning is the predominant concept, while the dawn is a part of the more detailed description of the breaking of the morning. The dawn is represented as a gigantic claw which takes hold of the earth on the horizon from north to south. During the period of dawn, the earth is changed by the growing light; it assumes a character which is comparable with the impression made by a seal (v. 14): its features "stand out" (*hithyatstsebh,* v. 14b). Jgs. 19:25ff. provides a similar picture of this sequence. The night ends with the rising of the dawn, and the morning breaks (v. 25). The "turn of the morning" soon follows, and then the full brightness begins (v. 26). Here, as in Job 38:4-15, the sun is not mentioned. It is evident from Gen. 19:15,23 that a considerable period of time elapses between dawn and sunrise (cf. 32:25,27, 32[24,26,31]). The night ends with the rising *shachar,* "dawn" (Gen. 32:25,27 [24,26]; Josh. 6:15). Now it is bright enough to set out on a journey (Gen. 19:15, 23; 44:3; 1 S. 9:26; 29:10).

Perhaps it is not always possible to determine the exact time of the oft mentioned "morning light." However, the night is at an end with the morning light, and during the morning light the accomplishments or crimes of the preceding night are surveyed (1 S. 14:36; 25:34,36; 2 S. 17:22). Now that which has been

---

[20] On this see below, II.1.b.

[21] Dalman, *AuS,* I, 600; Koehler; Aalen, 37, n. 3.

Material com direitos autorais

any more than the moon and the stars effect the night. The relationship of the sun to the day is not different from the relationship of the moon and the stars to the night. The day is the framework in which the sun functions, just as the night is the framework in which the moon and the stars function.

e. *The Paths of the Heavenly Bodies; Months; Years.* That, however, according to the OT view the sun and the moon are attributes of the day and the night does not mean they should be understood merely as random accidents. Their regular and rhythmically alternating movements connect them rather firmly with the structure of the world and with the course of time. The paths of the heavenly lights are an integral part of the order of the world and have their foundation in laws which are prescribed for them by the Creator (Jer. 31:35f.; Ps. 148:3-6; Job 38:33; Ps. 104:19; 19:6f.[5f.]). This raises no question about the priority of day and night over against the luminaries, since the covenant that God has made concerns day and night primarily (Jer. 31:35; 33:25; Gen. 8:22; Ps. 19:3[2]; 74:16). However, the movements of the sun and of the luminaries of the night have their place in the rhythmic alternation of day and night, but without effecting this alternation.

The paths and movements of the heavenly bodies are more important than their light-giving function. In fact, in the OT the light of the sun, moon, and stars is explicitly mentioned only in passages where they appear together, and this means in the framework of the day-night unity (Gen. 1:14-16; Jer. 31:35; Ps. 136:7; 148:3; Isa. 13:10; 30:26; 60:19; Ezk. 32:7f.; Joel 2:10; 4:15[3:15]). Except when it is connected with the sun or the sun and the stars, the moon is almost never mentioned (the exceptions are Ps. 8:4[3]; Job 25:5). As far as the relationship of the paths of the luminaries to the month and the year is concerned, the phases of the moon naturally played a basic role in the organization of the calendar (which was in fact a lunar calendar), and consequently in appointing the festivals (Gen. 1:14; Ps. 104:19). It is true that the actual phases of the moon are mentioned almost not at all in the OT, if we mean by this the increase and decrease of the light of the moon (Isa. 60:20). OT man was not interested primarily in the light of the moon, but in the beginning or middle of the new month. The movements of the moon served to mark the course of time, the alternation of day and night, and also the succession of the months (see Gen. 1:14; Ps. 72:5,7; 89:37f.[36f.]).

Even more important than this is that the OT texts know no distinction between a bright time of the year and a dark time connected with the path of the sun. According to Eccl. 12:2, the (relative) darkness of the winter is due to the cloudy sky, not to the low path of the sun. Actually, the Israelites had no clear idea about the influence of the sun on the change of seasons.[23] Naturally they were conscious of the great heat of the sun during the summer (Ex. 16:21; Isa. 49:10; Jonah 4:8; Ps. 32:4; Neh. 7:3), but this was explained by the fact that summer was a time when the sky was not cloudy. Also OT man connected the ripening of the

---

[23] See Dalman, *AuS*, I, 42f.

Material com direitos autorais

early fruit with the sun (Dt. 33:14; cf. Isa. 18:4f.). But nowhere in the OT is the annual path of the sun an object of interest. The context in which the sun was thought to function was consistently day and night. Only rarely is it placed within the context of the seasons, and then usually with reference to the summer heat.

Thus it seems impossible to assume that in ancient Israel there were cult practices or festivals which were related to the increase and decrease of sunlight in the framework of the seasons. This would presuppose that a solar interpretation of the world and of time was prevalent, as for example in Babylon. But this view had not been adopted in Israel.[24] Under these circumstances, there is no justification for the supposed connection between the Autumn Festival and the solar equinox,[25] or for explaining the fact that the Jerusalem temple faces east from the autumnal equinox.[26] Judging from the probable orientation of the second temple, which must have been parallel to the southern wall of the Herodian temple area, the temple did not face directly east, but was turned somewhat northward. This fits an orientation to the dawn rather than to the sunrise.[27]

f. *Light and Darkness As Cosmic Substances.* If light as light of the day is independent of the sun, this raises the question of whether light and darkness were understood in the OT as substances existing in the cosmic sphere. There are statements in the book of Job that may support this idea. Here the question is asked: "Where is the way to the dwelling of light, and where is the place of darkness?" (38:19f.). It is assumed that, like snow and hail (v. 22), light and darkness also were kept in "storehouses" somewhere in the cosmos. There are gates leading to the place where darkness is kept (v. 17). The dawn also has a "place" where it stays when it is not functioning (v. 12). The idea in 26:10 seems to be that the horizon is the boundary line between light and darkness, which would mean that light and darkness cross over this boundary alternately each morning and each evening.

The idea of substance is not obvious in Gen. 1. It is hardly the intention of the writer to give an account of the "origin of light" in v. 3. As a matter of fact, the substantive *ʾor,* "light," in connection with *hayah,* "to be," may have an adjectival meaning; so in Ex. 10:23; Zec. 14:7; perhaps also (without *hayah*) in Gen. 44:3; 1 S. 29:10 (where, admittedly, it can also be understood as a verb). If this adjectival interpretation of Gen. 1:3 is correct, then we may translate: "let it become light (bright)!" Then the "creation of light" would be nothing more than making the first morning or day bright, which corresponds to the representation of creation in Job 38:7,12. It would be easier to understand the darkness in Gen. 1:2 as a kind of substance, because it already existed before the first night. It is likely, though, that the narrator is thinking existentially and theologically rather than physically.

---

[24] See above, I.2.
[25] J. Morgenstern, *HUCA,* 22 (1949), 388.
[26] F. S. Hollis in *Myth and Ritual,* ed. S. H. Hooke (London, 1933), 91ff., and before him C. V. L. Charlier, *ZDMG,* 58 (1904), 386ff.
[27] Aalen, 83, n. 23.

Material com direitos autorais

2. *Light and Darkness in Human Existence.*

a. *Position of Darkness.* In spite of the relationship of darkness to chaos in Gen. 1:2, darkness is not thought of as a power hostile to God. The OT does not speak of a battle or a dualism between light and darkness. Here, neither the primeval ocean nor the darkness is considered to be a power of chaos in the sense of mythical adversaries of God. God acts on the ocean not for the purpose of destroying it, but only for the purpose of confining it to certain fixed limits, where it has a positive task in the household of the world. The role of darkness is to be understood as analogous to this. It is true that it is associated with the state of chaos (Gen. 1:2; Jer. 4:23), and is sporadically connected with sea monsters or with the sea (Job 3:8f.; 26:13; Isa. 5:30; Job 22:11). But in these cases the biblical writers are thinking of darkness as becoming too powerful and as overstepping its bounds. When the world was created, the limits of darkness were established. Although its rank is inferior to that of light, by creation it was built into the world order, viz., in the rhythmic alternation of day and night ordained by God. It is an "organized power of chaos." [28] God is the creator of both light and darkness (Isa. 45:7). His power and goodness transcend the antithesis of light and darkness (Ps. 139:12). He "turns deep darkness into the morning, and darkens the day into night" (Am. 5:8). In the creation he set this alternation of day and night in motion. This alternation constitutes time and establishes the world (Gen. 8:22; Ps. 74:13-16; 65:7-9[6-8]; Jer. 33:25; Job 38:4-15). [29]

However, this position of darkness in the world order, and consequently in the life of man, is full of tension. The good will of God is connected with light. Only light is described as "good" (Gen. 1:4), not darkness. There is as little room here for the idea that light was derived from darkness (as advocated by a monistic cosmogony or system [30]) as there is for the view that light and darkness had a common origin out of the divine *Urgrund*, the primeval foundation of all things.

The inferiority of darkness is shown in different ways: in the association of light and life, [31] of darkness and the Underworld, [32] of darkness and evil men; [33] in the figurative use of light in the sense of success and salvation and of darkness in the sense of failure and destruction; [34] in the idea that darkness is a potential power of chaos; [35] and finally in the expectation that darkness will be eliminated in the eschatological state of salvation. [36]

Until the final state of perfection comes, darkness represents a latent possibility of chaos, in fact an instrument in the hand of God. Darkness points to the tension

---

28 *Ibid.*, 10ff.; the Egyptian view is similar; Hornung, 74, 78ff.
29 See further H. Ringgren, *The Faith of the Psalmists* (1963), 119ff., on Ps. 104:19-23.
30 See above, I.2.
31 See below, 2.b.
32 See below, 2.c.
33 See below, III.3.a.
34 See below, III.1.
35 See below.
36 See below, II.2.f.

and interim character of this world and world order. Like the other "powers of chaos" (Sea, Wilderness), darkness makes man aware of the instability of the world, and represents the possibility that it can return to chaos. As creator of the world, God holds in his hand the possibility of putting an end to creation through the powers of chaos. An abnormal and comprehensive irruption of darkness would return the world to the state of chaos (Jer. 4:23f.). [37] But as long as darkness continues to operate within the limits prescribed for it in creation, it is not a power of chaos.

Earlier research was inclined to find a dualistic conflict between light and darkness in Genesis as an imitation of the prototype of Marduk's battle with the chaos monster in the Babylonian creation myth. [38]

b. *Light and Life; Light of the Eyes.* The superiority of light over darkness is expressed, among other ways, in the relationship which the OT makes between light and life. Here we must think primarily of natural light. Only in the light of creation can one have life. "To see the light" means "to live" (Job 33:28; 3:16). Children who are born dead have not seen the light (3:16) or the sun (Ps. 58:9[8]; Eccl. 6:4f.). The dead see the light no more (Ps.49:20[19]; Job 33:28). This synonymous meaning of light and life is evident in the pregnant expression *'or hachayyim* (Ps. 56:14[13]; Job 33:30), whether we translate it with Symmachus at Ps. 56:14(13) "the light of life," or with the LXX "the light of the living." [39] Light and life also appear together in Ps. 36:10(9): "For with thee is the fountain of life; in thy light do we see light." But it is probable that light here means "salvation, way, orientation." [40]

The light of the day is reflected in the light of the eyes (Prov. 29:13). An increase of this light means increased vitality and joy (Ezr. 9:8; Prov. 15:30; 1 S. 14:27,29). [41] The verb form *ha'ir* (hiphil) is also used in this sense (Ezr. 9:8; Prov. 29:13; Ps. 13:4[3]; 19:9[8]; cf. Eccl. 8:1). When the light of the eyes fails, a person is approaching death (Ps. 38:11[10]; 13:4[3]).

c. *Darkness in the Underworld.* In the Underworld (→ שְׁאוֹל *she'ôl,* "Sheol"), there is no alternation of day and night; it is a land "without order, and when it is bright (i.e., morning), it is as darkness" (Job 10:22).

d. *The Night.* The OT appraisal of night (→ חֹשֶׁךְ *chōshekh,* → לַיְלָה *laylāh*) is ambiguous. Night is the time when God intervenes and punishes the wicked (Ex. 11:4; 12:29f.; 2 K. 19:35; Job 34:20; cf. Gen. 32:25ff.[24ff.]), but it is also a time regulated and standardized by the cult (Isa. 30:29; Ps. 134:1), and a time of meditation and thanksgiving (Ps. 16:7; 63:7[6]; 92:3[2]; 119:55,62).

---

[37] See below, 2.f.

[38] See H. Gunkel, *Schöpfung und Chaos* (1895; [2]1921); A. Jeremias, *The OT in the Light of the Ancient East* (trans. 1911), 39. Pedersen, *ILC,* I-II, 464ff., argues on the other hand that the antithesis between light and darkness has many nuances in the OT.

[39] Aalen, 64.

[40] See below, III.2.

[41] Aalen, 64.

Material com direitos autorais

e. *Morning As Salvation.* In spite of these positive characteristics, the night lacks the most crucial characteristic, viz., God's intervention to save man. This belongs to the morning (Ps. 5:4[3]; 46:6[5]; 88:14[13]; 119:147; 130:6; 143:8; Isa. 8:20; 58:8; Hos. 6:3; → בקר *bōqer*). God's merciful deeds are "new every morning" (Lam. 3:22f.). According to Ps. 46:3ff.(2ff.), the coming of salvation in the morning means a restitution of creation, which is threatened by the powers of chaos. We should probably understand Job 38:4-15 to mean that not only the primeval morning, but every morning, signifies a renewal of creation. The fashion of the earth becomes visible (v. 14), and the wicked are removed from the earth (vv. 13,15). This daily renewal of creation is not connected with the sunrise[42] as it is in Egyptian literature,[43] but with the morning. This appraisal of the morning may be connected with experiences which the Israelites had had in the distress of battle (2 K. 7:5ff.; 19:34ff.; Ps. 46:6ff.[5ff.]). Furthermore, the custom of holding court trials and of giving the righteous the efficacious help of the law in the morning (Ps. 101:8; 2 S. 15:2; Jer. 21:12; Job 7:18; cf. Ps. 73:14) certainly contributed to this. The statements in Hos. 6:3b,5 are understandable against this background: "his (God's) going forth is sure as the dawn; he will come to us . . ." (v. 3b). "And thy (God's) judgment goes forth as a light" (v. 5b). These verses seem to presuppose that judgment was given at dawn (cf. 2 S. 15:2). Zeph. 3:5 and Ps. 37:6 provide important parallels.[44]

f. *Eschatological Elimination of Darkness.* The darkening of the heavenly bodies is an element in the prophetic preaching concerning the future.[45] We also encounter the idea in the OT that darkness itself will come to an end and that God's light alone will shine. Prophetic threats are directed generally against the light of heaven (Jer. 4:23; cf. Isa. 5:30) or explicitly against the luminaries, in fact against sun, moon, and stars together (Isa. 13:10; Ezk. 32:7f.; Joel 2:10; 3:4 [2:31]; 4:15 [3:15]). They will become black and will no longer give light. Only in Am. 8:9 is the sun mentioned alone. The earth will quake and even be returned to a state of chaos (Isa. 5:30; 13:9; Zeph. 1:15; Joel 2:10), but only for sinners (Isa. 13:9; Zeph. 1:16f.; Joel 2:11ff.). The basic theme is the coming of the day of the Lord (Am. 5:18,20; Isa. 13:9; Zeph. 1:14f.; Joel 2:1; 3:4[2:31]; 4:14[3:14]; → יום *yôm*). For the sinner, this day is a day of darkness (Am. 5:18,20; Zeph. 1:15; Joel 2:2).

The shaking of the luminaries refers to their light, but in particular to their ordered paths. When God appears, the "host of heaven" will be punished (Isa. 24:21-23). The old world order is about to be dissolved. According to Isa. 60:19, the sun and the moon will be superseded by God's eternal light. Conversely, it can be said that the light of the sun and of the moon will be abundantly increased in the time of salvation (30:26). It is likely that here, more or less clearly, we have the idea that an eternal day will dawn. This thought is clearly expressed in Zec.

---

42 Ringgren, *Festschrift Bleeker,* 144f.
43 See above, I.2.
44 See below, III.3.c.
45 See above, II.1.d.

Material com direitos autorais

14:7. In the time of salvation, there is "neither day nor night, for at evening time there shall be light." The rhythm of day and night has ceased, i.e., the present world time is at an end. The "ordered dualism" of light and darkness, which was given along with the rhythm of day and night and the movement of the heavenly bodies and is a part of the character of the present creation, is abolished by a state in which only day and light rule.

3. *Lamps*. Artificial light was usually provided by lamps (*nir* or *ner*, Job 18:5f.; Jer. 25:10; etc.). Lamps were set up in the sanctuary, but it is not clear whether they burned during the day (Ex. 25:31ff.; Lev. 24:2; 1 K. 7:49; 2 Ch. 13:11). A comparison of 1 S. 3:3 with 4:21 seems to suggest that the lamp of the sanctuary was understood as a kind of representation of God (cf. the lamps mentioned in Zec. 4:2).

Some scholars have attempted to date the illuminations which, according to Jewish sources, occurred in the temple grounds during the Feast of Tabernacles back into OT times. They identify them with the vigils which they suppose to be assumed in passages such as Ps. 134:1 and Isa. 30:29. Of course, for practical reasons we must assume that artificial light was used in any nocturnal festival in the sanctuary. Any symbolic interpretation is late, and the numerous suggestions of scholars remain uncertain. [46]

III. Figurative Use.

1. *Light As Prosperity, Salvation.*

a. *General Considerations*. The figurative use of light and darkness in the OT displays a richly varied picture. As a figure for success and well-being, light embraces a broad sphere (Am. 5:18,20; Job 17:12; 18:5f.; 22:28; Prov. 13:9; Lam. 3:2; Est. 8:16). Conversely, darkness stands for suffering and failure (Isa. 8:22; Jer. 23:12; Am. 5:18,20; Ps. 23:4; Job 17:12; 29:3; Lam. 3:2). In religiously oriented texts, light is a symbol for the salvation given by God (Isa. 9:1[2]; 58:8; Ps. 18:29[28]; 36:10[9]; 43:3; 97:11; Job 29:3). Also a verb meaning "to shine" with God as its subject can have a similar meaning (Ps. 18:29[28]; 118:27; Job 33:30). Less frequently the sun serves as a symbol of well-being and salvation (Jgs. 5:31; Jer. 15:9; Mal. 3:20[4:2]; → שמש *shemesh*). Sometimes "light" is replaced by "lamp," which is also a figure for success and salvation (Ps. 18:29[28]; 2 S. 22:29; Prov. 13:9; 24:20; Job 18:6; 21:17; 29:3; → נר *nēr*). A lamp set up in the house was a symbol for the prosperity and wealth of the family (Jer. 25:10; Prov. 31:18).

It is probable that this was the starting-point for the symbolic use of the lamp as a figure for the permanence of the royal house (1 K. 11:36; 15:4; 2 K. 8:19; Ps. 132:17; cf. 2 S. 21:17). Others want to see in the lamp ordered for the "anointed one" in Jerusalem (Ps. 132:17; 1 K. 11:36) the idea of a cultic symbol, or to identify the light of the "sacral kingship" directly with the light of the sanctuary. [47]

---

[46] Aalen, 58, n. 3.

[47] See above, II.3.

Material com direitos autorais

b. *God, the Light of Man.* In some passages, God himself is characterized as the light or lamp of man or of Israel (Ps. 27:1: "my light"; 2 S. 22:29: "my lamp"; Isa. 10:17: "the light of Israel"; 60:1: "your light"; Mic. 7:8: "a light to me"). It would be a mistake to see in such expressions a designation for the metaphysical nature of God. All that they indicate is the importance God has in man's life to provide him salvation and help. There is no essential difference between Ps. 18:29(28), which says that God "lights my lamp," and 2 S. 22:29, which states that God himself "lightens my darkness." [48]

c. *God's Light As Salvation, Success.* The situation is the same when the OT speaks of "the light of Yahweh" (Isa. 2:5), "his (God's) light" or "lamp" (Job 29:3), or in the same sense, of "thy light" (Ps. 36:10[9]; 43:3). Here too light is to be understood as a symbol not of God's person, but of the salvation which God gives. The reference to seeing the light in Ps. 36:10(9) is therefore not to be understood in a mystical sense. "To see the light" simply means to experience salvation or deliverance (Isa. 9:1[2]; 53:11 in the LXX and 1QIs[a]).

d. *Light of the Countenance of God.* The expression "light of the countenance" of God, which probably means "God's favor and grace" (Ps. 4:7[6]; 44:4[3]), stands somewhat by itself. This idiom appears in the secular sphere as well (Prov. 16:15; Job 29:24), and also in Ugaritic and Babylonian texts. [49] The same idea can be expressed verbally: God "makes his face to shine" (Nu. 6:25; Ps. 31:17[16]; 67:2[1]; 80:4,8,20[3,7,19]; 119:135; Dnl. 9:17). A "mystical" interpretation is also out of place for this expression; a word for "to see" is missing here.

2. *Walking and Way.*

a. *Success and Failure.* The figure of walking or of the way originated in OT thought from the conviction that the crucial point in life does not lie in theoretical observations, but in practical living. This symbolism is implied in the passages already mentioned above which speak of "the light of God." [50] "To walk in God's light" seems in Isa. 2:5 to mean "to walk in his paths" (v. 3), i.e., to live according to his instructions. However, the general idea is that man finds a way of well-being and salvation. Therefore, the light which God gives represents his protecting and preserving guidance (Ps. 43:3; Prov. 4:18; Job 22:28; 29:2f.; Isa. 9:1[2]; 42:16).

Conversely, in a similar connection darkness designates the way of the ungodly which leads to stumbling, i.e., destruction (Dt. 28:28f.; Jer. 13:16; 23:12; Job 12:24f.; 5:13f.; Prov. 4:19). But this does not mean that the godly person (or Israel) is spared from walking (or sitting, Mic. 7:8) in darkness, in order that he might subsequently see the light (Isa. 9:1[2]; 50:10; 53:11 in 1QIs[a] and the LXX), or if need be that he might have God's light in the darkness (Job 29:3).

---

48 On Isa. 60:1, see below, IV.6.
49 See above, I.2.
50 See above, 1.c.

Copyrighted material

b. *Instances of an Ethical Dualism.* The symbolic application of darkness to the deeds of the wicked, which occurs so often in Judaism, is found in the OT only by way of implication. Prov. 2:13, where "the ways of darkness" in which the wicked walk symbolizes their behavior, comes closest to this idea in the OT. Light occurs just as infrequently as a symbol of personal ethical purity (however, see Job 25:5). Only in Isa. 5:20 do light and darkness seem to be understood abstractly in the sense of good and evil. In the OT as a whole the ideas of light and darkness are not used in a figurative sense as religio-ethical qualities which describe the nature or behavior of people. Of course, the idea that night and darkness are the elements in which sinners operate (cf. Ps. 10:8f.; Prov. 7:9f.; Isa. 29:15) [53] is related to this way of thinking. The prevailing idea in the OT, however, is that darkness is a hiding-place for the wicked and a covering for their sins, while light exposes and convicts the wicked of their evil deeds in the daytime. That the "ethical dualism" of Judaism, [54] by a certain shift in emphasis, should have developed from this is easily understandable.

c. *Light and Justice; the Servant of the Lord.* The connection of justice (*mishpat*) with light and morning (cf. Zeph. 3:5; Mic. 7:9; Ps. 37:6) [55] also belongs here. The idea is that justice is brought to light or that it goes forth as light. The verb used here is *yatsa'*, hiphil *hotsi'*. The exegesis of Isa. 42:1-3 and 51:4f., where this terminology also occurs, is important, but it is disputed. The verb *yotsi'* (or *tetse'*) here can hardly be understood to mean "to lead or bring forth (to the nations)." [56] Instead, the idea is that the servant will cause justice to appear, to the best of the nations. If the verb *yatsa'* does have an object, it is light, i.e., the idea is that of bringing to light or making manifest (see, e.g., Job 12:22; 28:11). The construction in Mic. 7:9 and Zeph. 3:5 is to be understood in the same way.

According to Mic. 7:8f., man finds himself in darkness and God brings him to the light. This is similar to the situation described in Isa. 42:6f. (cf. 49:9). Thus, in these texts light represents not only the manifestation of justice, but also the salvation of the oppressed which is attained through justice. Light is salvation which manifests itself (cf. the use of "salvation" in Isa. 49:6; 51:5) and which is brought about by justice. Now inasmuch as justice has its source in the Torah (42:4; 51:4), the Torah is also, as it were, a light for those who are saved. Further, when the servant of the Lord himself is represented as a "light to the nations" (42:6; 49:6; cf. 51:4), this is because he mediates light, i.e., the justice which brings salvation (and perhaps also the Torah). The genitival construction here is an objective genitive, somewhat analogous to the expression "the light of Israel" (Isa. 10:17). [57]

---

[53] See above, 3.a.
[54] Cf. Qumran, see below, V.
[55] See above, II.2.e. on Hos. 6:3,5.
[56] So also Aalen, 90.
[57] See above, III.1.b.

Copyrighted material

qaran) after his meeting with the Lord (Ex. 34:29f., 35), is an exception. It is not explicitly stated that this shining originated with God, but it is probably assumed (cf. *kabhodh* in 33:18).[60]

5. *Solar Elements in the OT Picture of God?* An earlier generation of scholars was greatly concerned with the question of the extent to which OT terms for light which were associated with God might indicate a solar influence. However, a figurative use of the sun to designate God or his saving intervention is conspicuously rare in the OT. The only passage that can be mentioned is Mal. 3:20(4:2). (In Ps. 84:12[11], *shemesh* does not mean "sun," but "stronghold, defense"; cf. the parallelism and see Isa. 54:12.) → זרח *zārach,* "to rise," is not to be understood as referring to the sun in Isa. 60:1f.; Dt. 33:2.[61] The connection of the sun with justice and ethics, which is so familiar in the religious world around Israel, can hardly be demonstrated with certainty in the OT.[62] However, the comparison of the king with the sun, which is so popular in the ancient Near East, has left its traces in the OT (2 S. 23:4; cf. Prov. 16:15; Jgs. 5:31).

Scholars have often supposed that the chariot vision in Ezk. 1 is derived from Babylonian descriptions of the sun-god.[63] At Ugarit, the expression "light of the countenance of God"[64] has a solar background to the extent that the king is called "sun" in connection with this expression.[65] This background does not seem to be present in Babylonian texts,[66] and it does not appear in the OT. The background for the theophanic term *hophiaʿ* is to be sought in the dawn rather than in the rising of the sun (cf. Job 3:4,9; 10:22). However, Schnutenhaus wants to explain the theophanic terms *yatsaʾ*, *hophiaʿ*, and *zarach* as applying characteristics of the Babylonian sun-god to Yahweh.[67]

6. *Theophany and the Coming of Salvation; Isa. 60:1-3, etc.* The primary purpose of the theophany of God is the deliverance and salvation of the nation and of the individual. This thought must lead to the connection of the concept of theophany with the light symbolism of salvation. One indication of this connection is the use of the word "come" (→ בוא *bôʾ*, or synonymous terms) to describe God's manifestation in connection with the light symbolism of the theophany and the light symbols of salvation. These three elements are present in Dt. 33:2, but especially in Isa. 60:1-3. In this important eschatological passage, "the *kabhodh* (glory) of God" and perhaps also the word *zarach* (vv. 1-2; cf. Dt. 33:2) point to

---

[60] On the question of Israel's participation in God's light according to Isa. 60:1,3; 62:2, see below, 6.

[61] See below, 6.

[62] See above, III.3.a.

[63] E.g., A. Jeremias, *Handbuch der altorientalischen Geisteskultur* (²1929), 363; Aalen, 82, n. 6. On the problem connected with the Jerusalem temple facing east, and on the question of the temple and the solar equinox, see above, II.1.e.

[64] See above, II.1.d.

[65] See above, I.2.

[66] See Nötscher, *Angesicht,* 140ff.

[67] F. Schnutenhaus, "Das Kommen und Erscheinen Gottes," *ZAW,* 76 (1964), 9.

Copyrighted material

a theophany, while *zarach* also indicates the motif of salvation in the morning. This latter motif is suggested also by the expression "your light": the "light of Jerusalem" means the salvation that is imparted to Jerusalem, [68] or if "your light" is interpreted as "God's light," this means that God is the one who brings salvation. [69]

It is not the rising of the sun that provides a background for this figure, but the dawn, as is clear from the reference to the dawn in Isa. 58:8 (cf. *zarach* in 58:10) and to the twilight in 59:10. In 62:1, the verb *yatsa'* is used in connection with the acquittal which takes place at dawn (Hos. 6:3,5; Ps. 37:6; Mic. 7:9; Isa. 42:1,3; 51:4f.). [70] The torch mentioned in 62:1 also refers to the dawn (in distinction from the sunrise) (cf. Job 41:10f.[18f.]).

Furthermore, the reminiscence of the nocturnal wilderness wandering stands behind the whole section (cf. Isa. 42:16; 52:12). [71] The idea that Israel shares in the light itself (60:1,3), indeed, according to 62:2, even in the *kabhodh*, "glory," through the manifestation of God's light, is, however, distinctive in our verses. This hardly means that Israel shares in the divine nature. [72] The thing that is emphasized is not the nature of God, but what God gives to his people, viz., the whole condition of deliverance and victory (62:2), which, to be sure, is due to the nearness of God.

Therefore, the darkness described in Isa. 60:2, which covers the earth and the peoples, denotes the negation both of salvation and the nearness of God. The light is present only in Israel, and only as Israel experiences the coming age of salvation, thus causing the heathen to realize the nearness of God (60:3; 62:2). From this fact, later Judaism derived the theory that Jerusalem would be the cultic center of the whole world even in the eschatological age. The Jewish and NT idea of the eschatological "glorification" of the world and of the righteous can also be traced back to Isa. 60:1-3 and 62:1f. One parallel to these verses in Isaiah appears in Ezk. 43:2,5, where the east represents the salvation which comes in the morning, and the word *kabhodh*, "glory," represents the theophany. The following chapters in Ezekiel describe the age of salvation which has its cultic center in the new temple.

V. The Qumran Texts. In the Qumran literature, *'or, ma'or, ha'ir, hophia'*, and (once) *noghah* appear as terms for light. In the liturgical tradition of Judaism, the light of the day retains its independence from the sun, just as it does in the OT (1QS 10:1-3,10; 1QH 12:4-7; 1QM 14:13f.). [73] On the other hand, the sun is considered to be the "regulating principle of the world" (1QM 17:6f.), which represents something new in comparison with what we find in the OT (cf. the solar calendar). The Qumran literature states that the light of the stars is of

---

68 See above, III.1.a.
69 See above, III.1.b.
70 See above, II.2.e; III.3.c.
71 See above, III.2.a.
72 Cf. above, IV.4.
73 Aalen, 106f., 237ff.

Copyrighted material

heavenly origin (1QS 10:2f.), which corresponds to the thought of Judaism. The use of light to convey the idea of success, and of darkness to convey the idea of failure, is associated with the concepts of salvation (as glorification) in the eternal light of the hereafter (1QS 4:7f.) and of eternal destruction (1QS 2:8; 4:13) respectively. An ethical dualism of light and darkness, which is expressed in the view that two camps (the sons and spirits of light and the sons and spirits of darkness) stand in opposition to each other, is predominant (1QS 1:9f.; 3:3-26; 1QM 1:1-17; 13:2-16). The source of the light that brings salvation is God (1QS 11:3-5; 1QH 7:25; 9:26f.; 18:1-6), who has made the light shine on man (1QH 9:26f.), and thereby has given him salvation (1QH 9:26-29) and above all enlightenment (1QS 2:3; 4:2; 11:5). This enlightenment does not mean a substantial change in man (the passage that comes closest to this idea is 1QH 7:24). This participation in the realm of light has to do with new understanding and right conduct. The role light plays in trying and accusing man is not important. However, God's light or brightness is understood as a fire which consumes sinners (1QH 6:18f.; 1QM 14:17f.).

Light is not used in connection with God's person in the sense of a divine attribute.

Aalen

אוּרִים *ʾûrîm* → גּוֹרָל *gôrāl*

אוֹת *ʾôth*

Contents: I. 1. Etymology; 2. Statistical Survey; 3. Synonyms. II. Secular Use. III. Theological Use: 1. The Substance and Settings of Signs; 2. The Functions of Signs: a. Epistemic Signs; b. Signs of Protection; c. Faith Signs; d. Mnemonic Signs; e. Covenant Signs; f. Confirmation Signs; g. Sign-Acts (Symbolic Acts); 3. Conclusions.

I. 1. *Etymology.* The etymology of *ʾoth* is wholly uncertain.[1] If the *tav* may be regarded as an original feminine ending,[2] it may derive from the root *ʾvh,* which, however, means, "to wish, to desire."[3] Associating this word with Akk. *ittu,*[4] which sometimes denotes the sign of the oracle, does not lead to any helpful results.[5]

ʾôth. (Besides the commentaries): O. Bächli, *Israel und die Völker. AThANT,* 41 (1962); K. Baltzer, *Covenant Formulary* (trans. 1970); W. Eichrodt, "Der Sabbat bei Hesekiel. Ein Beitrag zur Nachgeschichte des Prophetentextes," *Lex tua veritas. Festschrift H. Junker*

(continued on p. 168)

1 Keller, 146; Rengstorf, *TDNT,* VII, 209.

2 Keller, 146.

3 *KBL*³, 20f.; but cf. J. L. Palache, *Semantic Notes on the Hebrew Lexicon* (Leiden, 1959), 3f.; *TDNT,* VII, 209, n. 51, "to establish, to mark(?)."

4 *CAD,* VII, 304-310; *AHw,* 405f.

5 *TDNT,* VII, 209; Keller, 148f.

Copyrighted material

2. *Statistical Survey.* The word *'oth* occurs 78 times in the OT; in 75 cases the LXX translates it by *sēmeíon.*[6] Since *sēmeíon* appears in the LXX only 125 times in all, it is clear that its major use is as a translation of *'oth.*

3. *Synonyms.* Alongside *'oth* there appear in the OT many synonyms which characterize the function of the sign or its exact nature. The most frequently used synonym of *'oth* is → מופת *môphēth,* "wonder" (in connection with *'oth:* Ex. 7:3; Dt. 4:34; 6:22; 7:19; 13:2,3 [Eng. vv. 1,2]; 26:8; 28:46; 29:2[3]; 34:11; Isa. 8:18; 20:3; Jer. 32:20,21; Ps. 78:43; 105:27; 135:9; Neh. 9:10); it appears in this connection almost exclusively in the Deuteronomic and Deuteronomistic literature and denotes (even when it is used without *'oth*) signs that confirm, warn, inspire fear, or prognosticate. *mopheth* is used in particular to describe the events connected with the exodus. It is impossible to prove that this word has "apocalyptic overtones."[7]

The synonym → זכרון *zikkārôn,* "memorial, remembrance" (which is used in connection with *'oth* in Ex. 13:9; on Josh. 4:6, cf. v. 7), sheds light on the function of *'oth,* inasmuch as it alludes to the mnemonic use of a sign. The purpose of a *zikkaron* is "to prevent something from being forgotten which deserves to be handed down, and to make it real over and over again";[8] therefore, it is natural to translate this word "remembrance, actualization."[9] The element of "public-

---

(1961), 65-74; O. Eissfeldt, *Hexateuchsynopse* (1922); *idem, The OT* (trans. 1965); V. Hamp, "Genus litterarium in Wunderberichten," *EstEcl,* 34 (1960), 361-66; J. Haspecker, "Wunder im AT," *Theologische Akademie,* II (1965), 29-56; F. J. Helfmeyer, *Die Nachfolge Gottes im AT. BBB,* 29 (1968); A. R. Johnson, *The Cultic Prophet in Ancient Israel* (Cardiff, ²1962); C. A. Keller, *Das Wort OTH als "Offenbarungszeichen Gottes". Eine philologisch-theologische Begriffsuntersuchung zum AT* (1946); R. Kilian, *Die Verheissung Immanuels Jes 7,14. SBS,* 35 (1968); H.-J. Kraus, *Worship in Israel* (trans. 1966); N. Lohfink, "Der Bundesschluss im Land Moab. Redaktionsgeschichtliches zu Dtn 28,69-32,47," *BZ,* N.F. 6 (1962), 32-56; D. J. McCarthy, *Treaty and Covenant. A Study in Form in the Ancient Oriental Documents and in the OT. AnBibl,* 21 (1963); M. Noth, *History of Pentateuchal Traditions* (trans. 1971); H. D. Preuss, " . . . ich will mit dir sein!" *ZAW,* 80 (1968), 139-173; G. Quell, "Das Phänomen des Wunders im AT," *Verbannung und Heimkehr. Festschrift W. Rudolph* (1961), 253-300; G. von Rad, *Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays* (trans. 1966); K. H. Rengstorf, "σημεῖον," *TDNT,* VII (1964), 200-269; W. Richter, *Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zum Richterbuch. BBB,* 18 (²1966); *idem, Die sogenannten vorprophetischen Berufungsberichte. FRLANT,* 101 (1970); L. Rost, "Weidewechsel und altisraelitischer Festkalender," *Das kleine Credo und andere Studien zum AT* (1965), 101-112; J. Scharbert, "Was versteht das AT unter Wunder?" *BuK,* 22 (1967), 37-42; G. Schmitt, *Der Landtag von Sichem. ArbT,* ser. 1, 15 (1964); C. Westermann, *Praise of God in the Psalms* (trans. 1965); *idem, Basic Forms of Prophetic Speech* (trans. 1967); W. Zimmerli, "Erkenntnis Gottes nach dem Buche Ezechiel," *ThB,* 19 (1963), 41-119; *idem,* "Ich bin Jahwe," *ThB,* 19 (1963), 11-40; *idem, ThZ,* 5 (1949), 374-76.

[6] Hatch-Redpath, *Concordance,* II (1954), 1263f.
[7] Keller, 61.
[8] *Ibid.,* 64.
[9] *Ibid.,* 65; cf. P. A. H. de Boer, *Gedenken und Gedächtnis in der Welt des ATs* (1962), 19, 38f.; W. Schottroff, *"Gedenken" im Alten Orient und im AT. Die Wurzel zākar im semitischen Sprachkreis. WMANT,* 15 (1964), 299-328.

Copyrighted material

ity" in *zakhar* can be seen from its use in legal genres, where it has the meaning "publish, introduce as evidence."[10]

The word → טוטפות *ṭôṭāphôth,* "frontlets" (used in connection with *'oth* in Ex. 13:16; Dt. 11:18), which emphasizes the function of *'oth* as a mnemonic sign, presumably means something similar to *zikkaron.*[11]

The synonym *'edh* indicates another function of *'oth,* viz., that of witnessing (*'edh* is used in connection with *'oth* in Isa. 19:20; cf. Ex. 4:8).

→ מסות *massôth,* "trials" (which is used in connection with *'oth* in Dt. 4:34; 7:19; 29:2[3]) has reference to the signs with which Yahweh "tried" Pharaoh. Yahweh put Pharaoh and perhaps also the Israelites to the test in order to find out whether they knew and acknowledged him.[12] The synonym *musar,* "discipline, education" (which is used in connection with *'oth* in Dt. 11:2, cf. v. 3), seems to attribute a similar function to the word *'oth.*

Other synonyms of *'oth* emphasize the divine power and might which are manifested in the "signs," especially in connection with the exodus. This is the case with *gedholah,* "great thing" (Josh. 24:17), *yadh chazaqah,* "mighty hand" (Dt. 4:34; on 6:22, cf. v. 21; 7:19; on 11:3, cf. v. 2; 26:8; on 34:11, cf. v. 12; Jer. 32:21), *zeroa' netuyah,* "outstretched arm" (Dt. 4:34; 7:19; on 11:3, cf. v. 2; 26:8; Jer. 32:21), *mora' gadhol,* "great terror" (Dt. 4:34; 26:8; on 34:11, cf. v. 12; Jer. 32:21), *milchamah,* "war" (Dt. 4:34), *kabhodh,* "glory" (Nu. 14:22), *shephatim gedholim,* "great acts of judgment" (on Ex. 7:3, cf. v. 4), *ma'asim,* "deeds" (Dt. 11:3). "The synonymity of *'oth* with *deghel,* 'standard,' that which may be seen and observed, is particularly instructive"[13] (*deghel* appears in conjunction with *'oth* in Nu. 2:2).

II. Secular Use. A "sign" by its very nature points to something. This simple observation makes it unlikely at best that the word *'oth* belongs primarily to the theological sphere.[14] There is no theological implication whatsoever in its use in the fourth Lachish letter, line 10,[15] which mentions fire signals (*mashsha'ath*) in conjunction with *'oth* in line 11, where they were being used to convey military information. A similar military context is suggested by the use of *'oth* for the signs of families (Nu. 2:2 [P]; similarly Ps. 74:4), by means of which the Israelite camp was arranged. This camp order is based on the "idea of a military camp,"[16] and the signs of families are flags or standards, which can hardly be assigned a theological function on the basis of their relationship to the tent of meeting, and thus be interpreted as a "sign of security which guarantees the divine order."[17] Josh. 2:12,18, where the sign requested as a pledge by Rahab and given by the spies is a scarlet cord bound in the window, also points to a war

---

10 H. W. Wolff, *Hosea* (trans. 1974), 145, with further literature.
11 Cf. Keller, 65f.
12 Cf. Quell, 288.
13 *Ibid.,* 292.
14 As Keller, 14, and others assert.
15 Cf. *KAI,* 194.10; *TDNT,* VII, 209f.
16 Cf. A. Kuschke, *ZAW,* 63 (1951), 74-105; M. Noth, *Numbers. OTL* (trans. 1968), 24.
17 Keller, 144.

Материјал заштићен ауторским правима

setting, although reflecting a legal situation in which the sign functions as an agreement or a guarantee. Job (21:29) refers to signs in the sense of "evidence" or "examples"[18] refuting the doctrine of retribution, thus appealing to the wisdom of experience, to which *'oth* as a sign of revelation is foreign.[19]

The secular use of the word *'oth*—in the military sphere as a designation for signs and for signals giving information, in the legal sphere as a designation for signs of a contract or a guarantee, in the sphere of experiential wisdom as a designation for evidence and examples, the kinds of signs which also appear in theological usage—makes it clear that this word was used originally in secular language,[20] whence it was probably borrowed concurrently or secondarily by theological usage.

III. Theological Use.

1. *The Substance and Settings of Signs.* "'*oth,* 'sign,' is an object, an occurrence, an event through which a person is to recognize, learn, remember, or perceive the credibility of something." In my opinion, this definition suggested by Gunkel[21] correctly emphasizes the functional character of a sign, for that which is crucial in a sign is not the sign itself or its execution, but its function and its meaning. The substances of signs are as protean as the world in which they occur.

An *'oth* may occur in different settings: creation, history, and cultic institutions. In harmony with the Israelite tendency to historicize, signs in creation and cultic institutions are often connected with historical events.

Signs in the order of creation or in nature include the lights in the firmament of the heavens (Gen. 1:14), the rainbow (9:12,13,17), second growth, wild growth, sowing and reaping (Isa. 37:30), an unexpected crop (Isa. 55:13), astral phenomena (Jer. 10:2), the permanence of the mountains and the stilling of the raging sea (on Ps. 65:9[8], cf. vv. 7f.[6f.]). Signs in history include above all the plagues in Egypt in particular and the events connected with the exodus in general (Ex. 7:3; Dt. 4:34; 6:22; 7:19; etc.). Signs connected with cultic institutions include circumcision (Gen. 17:11), the blood of the Passover lamb (Ex. 12:13), eating the *matstsoth,* "unleavened bread" (13:9), the consecration of the firstborn (13:16), the Sabbath (31:13,17; Ezk. 20:12,20), the stars (Gen. 1:14), and the covering of the altar (Nu. 17:3[16:38]).

2. *The Functions of Signs.* By assigning to these phenomena which exist or take place in creation, history, and cultic institutions the character of signs, these passages indicate that they have a significance beyond their outward form. Their meaning needs interpretation before it can be understood. This raises the question of the *function* of a sign.

---

18 *TDNT,* VII, 213.
19 Contra Keller, 47.
20 So also Quell, 292; *TDNT,* VII, 213, n. 78; Zimmerli, *ThZ,* 374-76.
21 H. Gunkel, *Genesis*[7], 150.

Copyrighted material

The function of a sign, like its outward form or substance, shows that its miraculous or striking nature is not what matters, for the intention of a sign is not to terrify the onlooker, but to mediate an understanding or to motivate a kind of behavior. When Moses works signs at God's command (Ex. 3:12; 4:8, 9,28,30), they serve to demonstrate his legitimacy to the people; the Israelites are not simply to respond to them in astonishment. If they had, these signs would have failed to accomplish their purpose. Moreover, Moses does not work signs for "his own greater glory," although they do establish his legitimacy. They establish his legitimacy as one sent from God, and also guarantee the reliability of the message with which he is sent to the Israelites. Similarly, the signs which God worked in Egypt were not designed primarily to terrify Pharaoh and his people, but to cause him to acknowledge "that I am Yahweh" (Ex. 7:3, cf. v. 5), or "that I, Yahweh, rule in the midst of the land" (Ex. 8:19[23], cf. v. 18[22]). The signs which God worked in connection with the exodus are meant to bring about the same result among the Israelites: the recognition and acknowledgment of Yahweh as the only God (on Dt. 4:34, cf. v. 35; cf. Ex. 10:2). The accusation that Israel has no mind to understand, no eyes to see, and no ears to hear, in spite of having experienced these signs (Dt. 29:2[3], cf. v. 3[4]), grows out of this concept. Behind this idea lies the expectation implicit in giving signs that they will arouse faith when they are recognized (Nu. 14:11), and promote readiness to hearken to Yahweh's voice (14:22), to take his words seriously (Jer. 44:29), to recognize the work of God in the fate of idolaters (Ezk. 14:8), and to acknowledge the intervention of God on behalf of his own (Ps. 86:17).

a. *Epistemic Signs.* This summary, which in essence is merely descriptive, makes it possible to categorize signs in the OT on the basis of their various functions. First of all, we will deal with epistemic signs, which must be placed in a larger context if their backgrounds are to be made clear.

Like all of God's works, his signs are intended to impart knowledge, and thus there are "imperative components in the knowledge formula." [22] There is such a close connection between knowledge and signs that, in the context of the knowledge formula, "to know" means virtually "to accept the certainty of something on the basis of a sign." [23] The knowledge formula belongs "by nature to the realm of symbolic events," [24] or, more specifically, to the realm of demonstrative signs. [25]

That the knowledge formula appears in the pre-priestly tradition concerning Moses (J) [26] raises the question of the source to which the "signs" belong, especially as it pertains to explicitly epistemic signs. Zimmerli's view concerning the knowledge formula [27] is supported by Eissfeldt's view that Ex. 7:3,5 belong to

[22] Zimmerli, "Erkenntnis," 67.
[23] *Ibid.*, 93; cf. *TDNT*, VII, 213-16.
[24] *Ibid.*, 95.
[25] *Ibid.*, 98.
[26] *Ibid.*, 66.
[27] *Ibid.*, 58, 61 on Ex. 7:5; 8:18(22); 10:2.

Матеріал, захищений авторським правом

parenetic historical retrospects.[48] The same setting is to be assumed for Dt. 29:2, 3(3,4). Here again, in 29:1-7(2-8), we are dealing with a parenetic historical retrospect which is intended to motivate the hearers to keep the covenant and to carry out the demands of the covenant, and not with the antecedent history of the covenant formula,[49] which is not even formally homogeneous.[50] Possibly 29:1-6a(2-7a) was originally a cultic text[51] with its locus in the proclamation of the law.

The fourth story of the plagues (Ex. 8:16-28[20-32]) takes on a parenetic function through the knowledge formula (v. 18[22]), even though this passage is not a parenetic text, but a narrative account[52] whose setting can no longer be determined. Here the plague of flies as such is not called a sign, but rather the protection of the people of God from this plague. This is a motif which appears in other plague stories (Ex. 9:4,26; 10:23; 11:7), and it is possible that this motif was the theme around which the plague stories were originally combined. The main emphasis here is on the protection or "redemption" (Ex. 8:19[23]) of Israel. Thus, in spite of the narrative framework in which this plague is presented, it is clear that at least Ex. 8:18f.(22f.) is a parenesis.

The same thing applies to Ex. 7:3,5. Here, the connection of the sign with the knowledge formula indicates a clear theological emphasis, and even though it is set in a narrative context it is a parenesis.

Jer. 44:29 is part of an announcement of judgment.[53] V. 25 states the transgression, v. 27 the announcement of judgment, and vv. 28f. the consequences of divine intervention: recognition of the potency of the divine word.[54] If the announcement of punishment to an individual in its pre-literary form is still closely connected with the "elements of the regular judicial procedure" from which it probably arose,[55] then the function of the sign in Jer. 44:29 as a witness (Isa. 19:20; cf. Ex. 4:8) is comprehensible. The preceding context, especially vv. 15-20, makes it clear that the announcement of judgment is connected with a disputation. But this would seem to indicate that the announcement of the sign was preceded by a corresponding question from the prophet's audience concerning the validity of the divine announcement of judgment.

In Ezk. 14:1-11 we find a hybrid form involving invective and legal style;[56] the legal style appears especially in v. 8, where the threats that God will set his face against one of his people and that he will cut him off from the midst of his people are derived from legal terminology.[57] By the addition of the knowledge

---

48 Zimmerli, "Erkenntnis," 66.
49 Contra Baltzer, 35; McCarthy, *Treaty*, 138; von Rad, 179.
50 So also Baltzer, 35.
51 So Lohfink, 38.
52 See above, Zimmerli, "Erkenntnis," 79.
53 On this form cf. Westermann, *Basic Forms*, 169ff.
54 Cf. the schema in *ibid.*, 171.
55 *Ibid.*, 172.
56 Zimmerli, *BK*, XIII/1, 302.
57 *Ibid.*, 311.

Матеріал, захищений авторським правом

formula, the "legal oracle is changed into a prophetic oracle of demonstration"[58] But, of course, this is not to deny that the two forms "and you shall know that . . ." and "I am Yahweh" were originally combined in a legal context.[59] The sign in this context includes the function of a sign as evidence and truth in the legal sense.

Ps. 86 is usually designated as a lament of the individual,[60] in which the worshipper asks for "a sign of salvation" (v. 17). Even if this song has its setting in the cult, the idea that this sign is an oracle announcing that God had heard or would hear is not the only possible interpretation.[61]

We may draw certain conclusions about the function of signs mentioned in these passages from the different types or genres that texts containing epistemic signs represent, of which parenesis is predominant. The primary purpose of parenesis is not to relate historical events, but to motivate people and to arouse them to action. Within the framework of the parenetic reflections on history, the signs are mentioned in order to motivate the hearers to acknowledge and to revere Yahweh as the only God (Dt. 4:34f.), or to be faithful to the covenant (29:2f.[3f.]). The sign is intended to help one see the seriousness of the divine announcement of judgment; therefore, it functions as evidence, which has its setting in the legal realm (cf. Jer. 44:29; Ezk. 14:8). Here, too, the sign serves to motivate the hearer to believe. The purpose of Ex. 8:18f. (22f.) is also parenetic, as is indicated, among other ways, by the knowledge formula. The emphasis in this sign is on the protection of the people of God from the plague; therefore, the purpose of this sign is also to motivate people: in this case, to motivate Israel to trust in Yahweh. On the other hand, the signs mentioned in Ex. 7:3 bring the Egyptians to a knowledge of Yahweh (7:5), not in the sense of faith and trust, but in the sense of acknowledging the superior power of Yahweh; thus, the function of signs to motivate people is present here also. Finally, the function of the sign in Ps. 86 (cf. v. 17), an individual lament, calls attention to the situation of the sign. Lament assumes need, in which a man reaches a limit of his own possibilities, beyond which only God can pass with a sign.[62] Here also, the purpose of the sign is to confirm something: the worshipper's faith that God will intervene and help, but also the psalmist's enemies' abashed realization that "thou, Lord, hast helped me and comforted me" (Ps. 86:17).

Therefore, a sign has different aspects: on the one hand, the God who provides it regards man, and on the other hand, man acknowledges the presence and the activity of God. To this extent the alternation between divine word and human response, between divine deed and human reaction, is evident in the epistemic sign.

---

58 *Ibid.*, 312.
59 Cf. *ibid.*, 56f.
60 Kraus, *BK*, XV³, 596.
61 Cf. *ibid.*, 599.
62 On the relationship between signs and situations of crisis, cf. Scharbert, 40-42.

Матеріал, захищений авторським правом

who has brought him out of Egypt into this land. The reference to the signs of the exodus occurs here in a liturgical formula,[81] which is "clothed in that hortatory style typical of Deuteronomy"[82] and is perhaps based on the schema of the Thanksgiving Song of the Individual.[83] The description of the situation in which Yahweh performed his sign, which was clearly a situation of affliction (vv.6f.), favors this latter suggestion.

This same situation is assumed in Josh. 24:17. The signs of the exodus motivate those whom Joshua addresses to determine to worship Yahweh (v. 16). Even if Josh. 24 can be considered pre-Deuteronomistic,[84] still, among other things, the connections of vv. 16,17b with the Deuteronomistic literature[85] and the fact that the form, at least, of this chapter derives from preaching[86] indicate that it is related to the Deuteronomistic literature. Schmitt takes this into consideration, for stylistic reasons considering Josh. 24 in part to be "a preliminary stage of Deuteronomistic preaching and literature."[87] Vv. 17f. contain a confession which possibly originated in the cult.[88]

The sign Isaiah offers Ahaz is also designed to arouse faith (Isa. 7:11).[89] Its purpose is to persuade Ahaz not to fear (v. 4), but to believe (v. 9).[90] It is closely connected with the preceding context, because it is intended to assure the one addressed that he would receive the divine help that had been promised, thus making it easier for him to base his decision on faith.[91] Thus, this offer of a sign has its setting in an announcement of salvation, which, however, Ahaz rejects with the argument that he will not demand of Yahweh and put him to the test (v. 12). This statement assumes that one "puts Yahweh to the test" by asking him for a sign (cf. Dt. 6:16; Ex. 17:2). Even though in the context of Isa. 7 Ahaz' argument must be considered an excuse based on supposed political considerations,[92] the assumption on which his argument rests expresses an opinion about asking for signs native to Israel and decidedly negative in nature, since it reveals a lack of trust. Since there is sufficient evidence that God was at work in history and in his promises (through the preservation of the Davidic dynasty), asking for a sign would be putting Yahweh to the test. Ahaz argues that it is possible to believe in God in a critical situation without a sign. But this situation is not concerned with a *request* for a sign, but with an *offer* of a sign which would make it easier for Ahaz and his people to believe. It is wrong for Ahaz to reject the divine offer, and therefore Isaiah gives Ahaz another sign (v. 14), which

---

81 *Ibid.*
82 Von Rad, *Deuteronomy*, 157.
83 Von Rad, *ThB*, 38, 12; *Deuteronomy*, 158.
84 Schmitt, 23.
85 *Ibid.*, 16f.
86 *Ibid.*, 17, 20.
87 *Ibid.*, 21.
88 *Ibid.*, 64.
89 Scharbert, 37: "to confirm the prophetic word."
90 Cf. O. Kaiser, *Isaiah 1-12. OTL* (trans. 1972), 91ff.; Kilian, 32.
91 Kilian, 31.
92 *Ibid.*, 33f.

Матеріал, захищений авторським правом

would be the Gilgal sanctuary, where this tradition may have been preserved as a "festival legend."[115] Noth thinks that vv. 6f. of this tradition are Deuteronomistic because they contain expressions that are identical with Dt. 6:20f.[116] All these considerations make it clear that the sign recalling the crossing of the Jordan, which may have been preserved in the framework of a "festival legend" which was read over and over again, had a parenetic function. Here too the sign is accompanied by a verbal interpretation.

Just as stones have no value as a sign apart from the interpretation and the historical event to which it refers, so also the covering for the altar made out of censers cannot serve as a sign without reference to a historical event and a verbal interpretation (Nu. 17:3 [16:38]). But since we are dealing with censers "of these men who have sinned at the cost of their lives" (17:3 [16:38]), because they rebelled against Moses and Aaron (16:1-3), and thus against Yahweh (16:11), the covering for the altar can be a sign (17:3 [16:38]) and a memorial (reminder) (17:5 [16:40], *zikkaron*); for they sinned with the censers, as is clear from 17:5 (16:40).[117]

In this context, which supports the claims of the Aaronides, the story of Aaron's rod belongs thematically (Nu. 17:16-26 [1-11]); in conjunction with Nu. 17:1-6 (16:36-41) it is to be understood as an appendix to the Levitical recension of P.[118] Like the covering of the altar, Aaron's rod serves as a sign of warning designed to remind the "rebels" (17:25[10]) of the God-given prerogatives of the Aaronides. It is obvious that these traditions were preserved or even originated in priestly circles. Their purpose is to remind the people of the inviolability of the priestly claims as a warning. To this extent, mnemonic signs here come close to being signs of warning.

e. *Covenant Signs.* A special category of mnemonic signs consists of covenant signs, of which the rainbow (Gen. 9:12f.,17), circumcision (17:11), and the Sabbath (Ex. 31:13,17; Ezk. 20:12,20) are named as examples in the OT. These signs are related to the covenant in different ways. While the rainbow reminds (Gen. 9:15f. → זכר *zākhar*) God himself of the covenant, or more exactly of his covenant promise (9:11, etc.), circumcision and the Sabbath seem at first glance to be covenant obligations which are to be performed by those who are participants in the covenant between Yahweh and Israel. To the extent that these signs recall the covenant between Yahweh and Israel, the signs of the covenant are related to mnemonic signs.

P goes beyond J in its delineation of the covenant idea (Gen. 9:1-17).[119] Approaching this subject from the viewpoint of salvation history, P divides the sealing of the covenant between Yahweh and man into three stages, and attaches a specific sign to each stage: the Noachic covenant with the rainbow,

---

115 So Hertzberg, *ATD*, IX², 31.
116 Noth, 37.
117 Cf. Noth, *Numbers*, 129f.
118 *Ibid.*, 122.
119 Von Rad, *Genesis*, 129.

Material com direitos autorais

the Abrahamic covenant with circumcision, and the Mosaic covenant with the Sabbath. In light of this Procksch characterizes the theology of P as a *"theologia foederis"* (a covenant theology).[120] Now, since it is customary, especially in pre-literary eras, "to establish a 'sign' on the occasion of solemn vows, promises, and other 'covenant ceremonies,' which is designed to remind the participants of the covenant at the proper time,"[121] the Noachic covenant also has a mnemonic sign, viz., the rainbow. It serves as "a sign for Yahweh himself . . ., so that he will not forget the promise which he has given."[122] Other passages in the OT refer to the bow which Yahweh uses in battle (Lam. 2:4; 3:12); lightning flashes are his arrows (Ps. 77:18f. [17f.]; cf. Hab. 3:9-11). Thus, the appearance of the rainbow may mean that God has laid his bow aside.[123]

According to the schematization of salvation history in P, Yahweh's covenant with Abraham follows in Gen. 17. Vv. 1-8 contain promises, while vv. 9-14 state the covenant obligation, which is identical with the sign of the covenant (v. 11). Wherever it is practiced, circumcision is regarded as "a tribal and cultic sign";[124] in Israel, "those who bear this sign . . . are participants in the divine covenant."[125] He who accepts this sign and bears it appropriates the covenant established by Yahweh and confesses his faith in him;[126] thus the covenant sign of circumcision became a sign of confession, and during the exile (along with the Sabbath) a unique *"status confessionis"* (state of confession).[127] Inasmuch as the uncircumcised are considered to be foreigners and unclean (Isa. 52:1), this covenant sign serves as a sign of distinction; any male in Israel who is not circumcised is subject to excommunication (Gen. 17:4). The text does not go on to affirm that this sign has the function of "covenant security."[128] As the sequence of the passage (beginning with v. 10) is obligation (vv. 10f.), the circle of persons involved in the obligation (vv. 12f.), and sanctions (v. 14), it is cast in "'legal' style."[129]

The regulation concerning the keeping of the Sabbath (Ex. 31:12-17), in the sequence of obligation (vv. 13, 14aα) and sanction (vv. 14aβ, bβ), also follows the structure of a legal text (vv. 15-17 are to be regarded as a later addition).[130] It is true that the Sabbath (→ שַׁבָּת *shabbāth*) is not explicitly called a "covenant" sign. However, there can be no doubt that this is its function because it is called a "sign between me and you" (v. 13), or a "sign between me and the people of Israel" (v. 17), and because, according to the way in which P divides history into

---

120 Procksch, *KAT*, I[2,3], 483.
121 Gunkel, *Genesis*[7], 150.
122 *Ibid.*
123 Procksch, 481; von Rad, *Genesis*, 130.
124 Gunkel, 269.
125 Procksch, 519.
126 Cf. von Rad, *Genesis*, 195f.
127 *Ibid.*, 196.
128 Procksch, 519.
129 Gunkel, 270.
130 Noth, *Exodus*, 241.

Material com direitos autorais

periods, the Mosaic covenant follows the Abrahamic covenant, and, like that covenant, must have a covenant sign. Through the expression "that you may know that I, the Lord, sanctify you" (v.13), which probably is based on Ezk. 20:12, this covenant sign also takes on the character of a mnemonic sign.[131] By this sign, which, like circumcision, is also a sign of confession and a mark of distinction, Israel and all the world know that Yahweh "sanctifies" Israel (v.13), i.e., that he has separated them from the nations, taken them unto himself for a possession, and placed them under his protection.

Ezk. 20:12 is similar to Ex. 31:13 in form and content. This similarity argues less for a later priestly redaction of this prophetic text[132] than for the "roots of Ezk. in the priestly legal tradition,"[133] since the Sabbath seems to be firmly established in the text of Ezk. 20 (vv.12,13,16,20,21,24). In the context of a historico-theological invective, the Sabbath appears as an epistemic sign (vv.12, 20) of the divine election of Israel (v.12) and of the covenant between Yahweh and Israel (v.20). For Israel, the Sabbath was a "sign of confession of the Yahweh covenant"[134] more than a "sign securing Yahweh's relationship to his people,"[135] since, as the context shows (vv.14,17,22), the existence of the covenant does not depend on fulfilling the Sabbath law. But by celebrating the Sabbath, Israel does recall her relationship to Yahweh based on Yahweh's election and the covenant. To that extent, this sign of the covenant acquires the significance of a sacramental sign.[136] In this context, the observance of the Sabbath is the "outward sign," Yahweh's election and the covenant are the "inward grace" to which the sign points and which it makes present.

f. *Confirmation Signs.* The significant thing about a sign is not the sign itself, but its function. Therefore, a sign has an auxiliary function, since it calls attention to, confirms, or corroborates something beyond itself, as is the case with the confirmation signs, which sometimes overlap with epistemic and faith signs.

In Ex. 3:12 (E), God gives Moses a sign as a corroboration of his mission and its success (cf. a parallel incident in Jgs. 6:17). Strangely, the sign does not take place at once, but is postponed to a future date: God promises Moses that he will appear to the Israelites at the same place where he is now appearing to Moses.[137] The future character of this sign has led Noth to assert that v.12 "has obviously been transmitted in a fragmentary state," since the text does not mention the sign promised to Moses.[138] But there are other passages in the OT where a sign designed to confirm or corroborate a divine message does

---

131 Cf. Botterweck, *Gott erkennen. BBB,* 2 (1951), 87f., "Gotteserkenntnis und Sabbatheiligung"; *idem TüThQ,* 134 (1954), 134-147, 448-457, esp. 144f.

132 So Eichrodt, "Sabbat," 71; *idem, Ezekiel. OTL* (trans. 1970), 268.

133 Zimmerli, *BK,* XIII, 447.

134 *Ibid.*

135 Eichrodt, "Sabbat," 65.

136 *Ibid.*, 66, 69.

137 Beer, *HAT,* 3, 29.

Material com direitos autorais

will meet two men by Rachel's tomb), 3f. (Saul will meet three men at the oak of Tabor), and 5f. (Saul will meet an ecstatic band of prophets at Gibeath-elohim). The realization of these signs which Samuel announced is intended to confirm to Saul that Yahweh had anointed him to be prince over his heritage (10:1, LXX and Vulg.). These commonplace events become signs "whereby Saul can see the reality of the event"[149] by the context in which they occur. But neither Samuel nor Saul has anything to do with these signs fulfilling their intended function. This is God's work, for "God gave him (i.e., Saul) another heart; and all these signs came to pass that day" (10:9). The connection between these two statements is hard to determine. Hertzberg connects the "change of heart" with Saul's ecstasy, and transfers this line to the end of v. 10.[150] However, this transposition is not necessary if we compare this text, e.g., with Dt. 29:2f.(3f.) and Ex. 7:3. Then it becomes clear that the proper function of a sign is guaranteed only when Yahweh gives an "understanding heart" to those who experience the signs (Dt. 29:2f.[3f.]). To be sure, signs take place when this is not the case, but they do not fulfil their proper and lasting purpose of leading people to a knowledge of Yahweh and to faith in him. Accordingly, Pharaoh does not know the signs in their essential function because Yahweh hardens his heart (Ex. 7:3), just as a God-given "new heart" is necessary to obedience (Ezk. 36:26f.; cf. Jer. 31:33f.). Not only the establishment of the sign, but also the mediation of its correct understanding has its origin with God. Therefore, in our passage (1 S. 10:9), the meaning is that God gives Saul another heart, "and *thus* these signs come to pass" as God intended, i.e., with the function of confirming Saul's faith. They do not fail to be effective as confirmation signs, because God "gives Saul another heart."

1 S. 2:34 also speaks of a confirmation sign. Like the sign announced in Ex. 3:12, this sign is put off into the future. By the death of his two sons on the same day, Eli can know the accuracy of the prophetic announcement of judgment (the nucleus of which appears in vv. 31f.). Therefore, the expression "and this shall be the sign to you" means the same thing as "and this is the way in which you shall know the truthfulness of my word." This sign is mentioned in a context that describes the sinful practices of the sons of Eli (2:12-17, 22-25), and then judges it from a theological point of view (in the prophetic announcement of judgment), a feature of Deuteronomistic texts.[151]

Confirmation signs may be commonplace or miraculous. The sign Hezekiah requests (2 K. 20:8) to confirm Yahweh's promise that he would be healed (v. 5) is miraculous. Isaiah gives Hezekiah the choice of asking that the shadow go forward or backward ten steps (v. 9), and understandably he decides to ask that the shadow go backward (v. 10). The sign takes place after Isaiah cries to Yahweh (v. 11; par. Isa. 38:22,7 and context). The possibility of a magical interpretation is eliminated from the miraculous execution of the sign through Isaiah's appeal to Yahweh.

---

149 Hertzberg, *ATD*, IX², 66.
150 *Ibid.*, 60, n. 5; cf. p. 67.
151 *Ibid.*, 26.

Bahan dengan hak cipta

g. *Sign-Acts (Symbolic Acts).* Very closely related to confirmation signs are signs that prophets perform in the framework of their so-called symbolic acts or sign-acts (Isa. 8:18; 20:3; Ezk. 4:3). These signs do not attract attention because they are miraculous, but because they are peculiar.[152] Without an appropriate interpretation, they remain largely unintelligible. A sign-act and verbal interpretation belong together; and it is erroneous to infer from the sequence in the texts under consideration, where execution of the sign is followed by interpretation, that a temporal and material distinction should be made between them, and then to conclude from this that these signs did not have the function of clarifying a prophetic oracle.[153]

Thus, the names of Isaiah's sons, "A remnant shall return" (cf. Isa. 7:3) and "The spoil speeds, the prey hastes" (cf. 8:1-3), are intended to clarify or confirm the prophetic oracles with which they were associated (on 7:3, cf. 10:21f.; on 8:1-3, cf. 8:4 and 7:7-9). Their names and the name of Isaiah himself, which means "Yahweh is (works) salvation," are signs and portents in Israel (Isa. 8:18). Also, the name of the prophet himself confirms the oracles associated with it, especially the oracle handed down in Isa. 12:2f., which speaks of God's "salvation."[154]

Isaiah's going about naked and barefoot is also an *'oth,* and a *mopheth,* "portent" (Isa. 20:3), to confirm and clarify the fate of the Egyptians and the Ethiopians as it is announced in v. 4. This sign-act also stands in a larger context and serves to confirm the calamity threatened against Egypt in 19:1-25 (cf. esp. 19:4).

Just as the prophetic oracles threatening calamity (Ezk. 5:5-15) anticipate verbally the events that they announce, so the sign-acts that accompany them describe the event symbolically (4:1–5:4).[155] Such signs intensify the oracle with which they are associated, perhaps even provoke it, since their striking execution awakens in those who witness the sign the question of its meaning, and thus they are in no sense "independent means of preaching,"[156] since they reveal a clearly discernible relationship to the word. The sign-act of the siege of the city (4:1-3) represents that which is stated in the interpretation given in 5:5-15. Whether the sign-act with the plate, which is explicitly called a "sign for the house of Israel" (4:3), is an original part of the context or a "later expansion,"[157] does not alter the sign character of the act at all, which probably goes back to Ezekiel, even if it may have been added by him later.[158]

3. *Conclusions.* It is impossible to limit the use of *'oth* to a specific literary stratum or to a specific traditio-historical stage, but predominantly it is found

---

152 Quell, 293: "The peculiar characteristic of these signs is that they seek to gain sympathy for the absurd and the challenging."

153 Contra Keller, 99.

154 Cf. Kaiser, *Isaiah 1-12,* 169.

155 Cf. Zimmerli, *BK,* XIII, 103.

156 Eichrodt, *Ezekiel,* 81; similarly *TDNT,* VII, 217, but cf. the restriction placed on this point here.

157 So Zimmerli, 113; cf. the evidence he gives for this on pp. 101f.

158 *Ibid.*

Bahan dengan hak cipta

ʾach also means one's kinsman, e.g., Gen. 14:14, 16 (Abraham's nephew, Lot; cf. 13:8, "we are brothers"), and in a broader sense a fellow tribesman or a fellow countryman, e.g., Gen. 31:32 (Jacob and Laban: "in the presence of our brothers," i.e., kinsmen); Ex. 2:11; 4:18 (the Hebrews are the "brothers" of Moses); Lev. 10:4 (the sons of a cousin); 25:25 (the one responsible as *goʾel,* "redeemer"); Nu. 20:3 ("our brethren" = the Israelites); Josh. 1:14f. (the other Israelites in relation to the Reubenites and the Gadites); Jgs. 9:18 (Abimelech is the brother, i.e., the fellow tribesman of the citizens of Shechem). Basic to this latter use of the word is the idea that the tribes and the nation descended from a common father.[13] Thus, "thy (our, etc.) brothers" and "the children of Israel" often appear side by side in apposition to each other (Lev. 25:46; Dt. 3:18; 24:7; Jgs. 20:13; cf. Nu. 25:6). In several passages, this genealogical concept of history is expressed by making individuals representatives of a tribe or of a nation, and by describing relationships between tribes in categories normally used for family relationships: Canaan shall become a slave to his brothers (i.e., the Israelites) (Gen. 9:25); Ishmael will be an enemy to his brothers (i.e., to other tribes) (16:12; 25:18); in the Blessing of Jacob, Simeon and Levi are addressed as brothers (49:5); in the account of the conquest of the land, the tribes of Judah and Simeon are referred to as brothers (Jgs. 1:3,17), who even speak to each other; the Israelites ask the oracle: "Shall we again draw near to battle against our brethren the Benjaminites (i.e., the tribe of Benjamin)?" (20:23,28). This type of expression occurs quite often when reference is made to Jacob and Esau or Israel and Edom: Isaac blesses his sons and promises that Esau will serve his brother (Gen. 27:29,40); toward the end of the wilderness wandering the Israelites send messengers to Edom, saying, "Thus says your brother Israel" (Nu. 20:14); similarly, in Dt. 2:4,8, the Edomites are called "your brethren the sons of Esau." Dt. 23:8(7) refers to this brotherly relationship when it says: "You shall not abhor an Edomite, for he is your brother"; Amos reproves Edom because he "pursued his brother with the sword" (Am. 1:11); in Ob. 10,12; Mal. 1:2ff., there are references to Edom's shameful treatment of their Israelite brothers.

Quite often *ʾach* is used of compatriots or members of the same nation. The law of the king in Deuteronomy forbids the Israelites to make a foreigner (→ נכרי *nokhrî*) king ("one from among your brethren you shall set as king over you," 17:15). With the same emphasis against foreigners, prophets are to be raised up "from your brethren" (18:15). In Dt. 23:20f.(19f.), the Jews are indeed allowed to take interest from a *nokhri,* but they are forbidden to demand interest from an *ʾach*. Dt. 24:14 makes a distinction between an *ʾach,* "a brother," and a → גר *gēr,* "a sojourner," although the Israelites have the same responsibility to both in this passage (cf. Dt. 23:8[7], where the Israelites are said to have the relationship of a *ger* to the Egyptians). Neh. 5:8 speaks of "our Jewish brethren." Isa. 66:20; Mic. 5:2(3) (cf. Jer. 29:16) speak of the Israelite brethren in the Diaspora and of their return.

---

13 *ILC,* 57f.

Material com direitos autorais

the brother of a dead man is obligated to marry his sister-in-law. The duty of *ge'ullah,* redemption, is also the duty of a brother, Lev. 25:25 (→ גאל *gō'ēl*).

Some scholars have tried to prove that there are remnants of a family system which was controlled by the authority of brothers among the Hittites, the Hurrians, and the Elamites: the brother gives the sister to her husband "for sisterhood," [16] one can adopt another as his brother, [17] etc. But according to Skaist this is true only in exceptional cases, as e.g., when the father is dead. The attempts to demonstrate similar conditions in Israel [18] are precarious. [19]

IV. Theological Use. The strong family solidarity of the Israelites also includes the relationship between brothers and sisters. He who has neither a brother nor a *rea'*, "friend," is defenseless (2 S. 13:3,6; cf. Eccl. 4:8). The story of Cain is typical (Gen. 4). Cain violates the simplest duty which he has to Abel, and then passes off the accusation of God with the words, "am I my brother's keeper?" (4:9); in saying this, he disavows an otherwise obvious responsibility. Thus, the text also emphasizes in particular that the blood of his brother cries out (→ צעק *tsā'aq*) to God for revenge. On the other hand, it is considered to be a special tribute to the Levites that they killed even their own sons and brothers who were guilty of idolatry (Ex. 32:29): by doing this they set loyalty to God above family solidarity.

With the extension of the idea of brotherhood to all fellow tribesmen and fellow countrymen came also the increased demand for solidarity. In the Holiness Code and Deuteronomy there are numerous references to duties toward a brother. Since all Israelites are brothers, one should help everyone who becomes poor (Lev. 25:35f.). Deuteronomy especially emphasizes this duty (15:7,9,11f.), and even applies it to the way one treats his brother's domestic animals (22:1-4). One is forbidden to bear false witness against a brother (19:18f.—in the similar law in Ex. 20:16, the word *rea'*, "neighbor," is used).

Jeremiah's brothers and the house of his father dealt treacherously with him (Jer. 12:6); therefore, he warns his hearers not to trust in a brother or a neighbor because they are all deceivers (9:3[4]). Similarly, Job laments that his brothers and friends (*rea'*) have dealt treacherously with him (6:15). One who robs his "brother" (missing in the LXX) and does evil to one of his fellow countrymen deserves to die (Ezk. 18:18). Isa. 66:5 contains this promise to those who are faithful to Yahweh: "your brethren who hate you . . . shall be put to shame." In the descriptions of suffering in the Psalms of Lament where the worshipper says that he has been forsaken by his brothers and his friends (companions) (Ps. 69:9[8]; 88:9[8] speak only of "companions," while Job 19:13 refers to both *'ach,* "brethren," and *yodhea'*, "acquaintances"), what is being depicted is a disruption of the normal social relationship.

---

16 Koschaker, 14, 28f.
17 *Ibid.*, 37ff.
18 Gordon.
19 However, cf. Speiser.

Material com direitos autorais

Sayings in the Wisdom Literature express the same view of brotherly solidarity; and yet, they declare that good friends can be better than brothers (Prov. 18:24; 27:10; cf. 17:17, where "friend" and "brother" are used synonymously). Prov. 18:19 and 19:7 have in mind a schism in the brotherly community; 6:19 counts the one "who sows discord among brothers" as one of the seven abominations, and Ps. 133:1 emphasizes how pleasant it is "when brothers dwell in unity."

V. Use in Proper Names. Finally, *'ach* appears as a component in certain proper names. In obvious theophoric names like *'achiyyah,* "Ahijah," and *yo'ach,* "Joah," "Yahweh is (my) brother," or *'achi'el,* "Ahiel," "my brother is El," the deity is characterized as a relative in typical ancient West Semitic fashion (→ אב *'ābh*).[20] In the name *'achimelekh,* "Ahimelech," *melekh,* "king," must be a designation for God. In other names like *'achiram,* "Ahiram," "my brother is exalted," a person's own blood brother could be meant. But even here it is likely that originally the divine brother was meant, although this idea was soon forgotten.

Ringgren

[20] Noth, *IPN,* 66ff.; cf. Huffmon, *APNM,* 160f.; Gröndahl, *PNU,* 91.

אֶחָד *'echādh*

Contents: I. General Observations. II. One God: 1. In the Ancient Near East; 2. One Yahweh; 3. One Creator; 4. Eccl. 12:11. III. Use in the Created Realm: 1. Uniqueness Through Election; 2. Original or Future Unity of Those Presently Divided; 3. Solitude As a Negative Factor; 4. Equality of Fate. IV. Theologically Relevant Expressions Using *'echadh.*

I. General Observations. The numeral *'echadh,* "one," begins the series of ordinary numbers. It is an adjective. It can be used as a cardinal, ordinal, and distributive number. In prose literature from the time of Solomon, it already

'echādh. P. R. Ackroyd, "Two Hebrew Notes," *ASTI,* 5 (1966/67), 82-86; W. F. Bade, "Der Monojahwismus des Dtn," *ZAW,* 30 (1910), 81-90; E. Jacob, "Ce que la Bible dit de l'unité et diversité des peuples," *Revue de Psychologie des Peuples,* 16 (1961), 118-133; G. A. F. Knight, "The Lord is One," *ExpT,* 79 (1967/68), 8-10; C. A. Labuschagne, *The Incomparability of Yahweh in the OT* (1966), 137f.; B. Otzen, *Studien über Deuterosacharja* (1964), 205-208; F. Perles, "Was bedeutet יהוה אחד Deut. 6, 4?" *OLZ,* 2 (1899), 537f.; G. Quell, "κύριος," *TDNT,* III, 1079-1081.

On II.1.a.: J. Bergman, *Ich bin Isis. Studien zum memphitischen Hintergrund der griechischen Isisaretalogien* (1968); R. O. Faulkner, "Some Notes on the God Shu," *JEOL,* 18 (1964), 266-270; E. Otto, *Gott und Mensch nach den äg. Tempelinschriften der griech.-röm. Zeit* (1964); T. Säve-Söderbergh, "The Solitary Victory," *Pharaohs and Mortals* (1961), 159-170; K. Sethe, *Amun und die acht Urgötter von Hermopolis* (1929); J. Zandee, *De hymnen aan Amon van Papyrus Leiden I 350* (Leiden, 1947).

Material com direitos autorais

appears as an indefinite article. As a numerical adjective and adverb it takes on meanings such as "only," "unique," "prominent," "alone," "same, uniform," "entire, undivided." As an element in various expressions, its use is even wider (cf. English "as one man," "all one," "one with"). There are other Hebrew words which are closely related to *'echadh,* and partially used interchangeably with it: → בדד *bādhādh,* "alone," *yachadh,* "union, all together," → יחיד *yāchîdh,* "only, alone, solitary," *lebhadh,* "alone," *ri'shon,* "the first." In the Hebrew OT, *'echadh* had not yet come to be used in a theological program. Therefore, we cannot deal with *monotheism* in this article. However, *'echadh* is found in religious and theological statements of varying importance and with meanings which do not wholly agree.

II. One God.

1. *In the Ancient Near East.* In spite of its polytheism, the world around Israel could speak of "one" God.

a. *Egypt.* The word *w'* appears several times with a substantival meaning as a divine epithet, "The One, The Only."[1] It is important to a correct understanding of the Egyptian idea of God that a whole series of gods is given this title. E.g., it can be shown that *w'* was applied to Atum, Re, Amun, Ptah, Aton, Thoth, Geb, Horus, Haroëris, Khnum, and Khonsu.[2] In this sense, frequently a *w'w* is added to this word to reinforce it after the manner of an etymological figure,[3] perhaps meaning "The Most Unique One." *ḥr ḫw.f,* "after his kind," serves as a more precise designation of uniqueness. But even more frequently *w'* is emphasized by means of a negative supplement, especially *nn kyy ḥr ḫw.f,* "there is none other after his kind"; *nn śnnw.f,* "he has no second."[4]

When one considers more closely the contexts in which this uniqueness of God is emphasized, it is striking that the creation, "the first time" (*sp tpy*), is mentioned quite often. The solitariness of the Primal God before the creation is a favorite theme (cf., e.g., The Book of the Dead 17 = *Urk.,* V, 6ff.). Thus, Amun is the Only One in Primeval Time, "the Great and Oldest One, who belongs to Prehistoric Time" (*Urk.,* IV, 111, 9). The solitariness of his being is naturally confirmed by his being the first originator, who set in motion the beginning. This aspect is often expressed in a long formula, which is called to mind by Jn. 1:2.[5] As creator of all, he is also called *nb w',* "One Lord," and is *w' ir nt.t ḳmȝ wn.t,* "the Only One, who has made what is and has created what exists" (*Urk.,* IV, 495, 4). The common expression *nṯr w' ir św m ḥḥw,* "the only God, who has splintered himself into millions," emphasizes the extremely close connection between the greatly variegated world and the "One

---

1 *WbÄS,* I, 275, 10.
2 Zandee, 70, gives some references.
3 *WbÄS,* I, 275, 15-16; 277, 9; cf. the less frequent combination *w' w'ty,* 279,1.
4 Otto, 11ff., mentions several variants; his large collection of examples deals with some thirty gods and goddesses.
5 So perhaps Zandee, 72ff.

Lord of creation," and points to an extremely pantheistic understanding.[6] In general, expressions using *wʿ* and *ḥḥw* occur frequently, so that the connection of the god *Ḥḥ* with Shu, the first emanation of the Primal God Atum, results in several significant constructions. Goddesses also appear frequently as *wʿ.t(t)*, sometimes interpreted as "the Solitary Eye" or the Royal Uraeus.[7] This term is applied to Hathor (Dendera is "the house of 'the Only One'")[8] and Isis (Θιουιν < *t3 wʿ.t* as a genuine name of Isis in a hymn from Medinet Madi)[9] in particular.

It is significant that the king often appears as "the Only One," which is characteristic of the Egyptian royal ideology. Apparently he is given this title because of his role as the representative of the creator-god on earth (thus, Thutmose I is called "the perfect God of the First Time," *Urk.*, IV, 83, 11).[10] This uniqueness of the king is emphasized quite often in contexts of war in documents from the New Kingdom. The king defeats the hostile, chaotic powers and maintains order. The designation of Hatshepsut as *wʿ.t.t Hr* (*Urk.*, IV, 390) is parallel to the title of the goddesses mentioned above.

b. *Mesopotamia.* In Sumerian there are several words for "one," the different usages of which have never been investigated. Deities are often designated as "unique" or "solitary." In Akkadian we find *ištēn,* "one" (cf. Heb. *ʿashte ʿasar,* "eleven") and (*w*)*ēdu,* "only," "alone" (→ יחד *yachadh*); see *CAD,* VII, 275ff., or IV, 36ff. In many expressions *ištēn* and *ēdu* are used alternately without any distinction in meaning, e.g., *pâ ištēn/ēda iššaknū,* "they came to an agreement." Also, there is no detailed investigation of the theological implications of these words.

Among divine beings and kings, *ištēn,* "one, a person," can have the meaning "solitary, separate" (*CAD,* VII, 287a). This is the case in an ancient Assyrian incantation text for the female demon Lamashtum[11] and in the Song of Agushaya for the warlike goddess Ishtar.[12]

c. *Ugarit.* In a mythological text, after the completion of the building of his palace, the god Baal declares that he alone (*ʾḥdy*) is king over the gods (*CTA,* 4 [II AB], VII, 49-52). The emphasis on the word "alone" causes one to suspect that the situation was that Baal's rule was under constant threat by Mut, the god of drought. Baal's royal rule is coexistent with the peaceful kingship of the creator-god Ilu.[13]

---

6 Otto, 58f., 106.
7 *WbÄS,* I, 278, 6; 279, 11.
8 *WbÄS,* I, 278, 7.
9 Bergman, 225, 280ff.
10 Säve-Söderbergh, 159ff.
11 *BIN,* IV, 126, 1; von Soden, *Or,* N.S. 25 (1956), 141ff.
12 *VAS,* 10, 214, III, 4; r. VI, 21; *RA,* 15 (1918), 178, r. VI, 8; on the song: H. Ringgren, *Word and Wisdom,* 69ff.
13 W. H. Schmidt, *BZAW,* 80 (²1966), 64ff.

2. *One Yahweh.* There are many keywords in the Deuteronomic/Deuteronomistic vocabulary which are often repeated in this material, but *yhvh 'elohenu yhvh 'echadh,* "Yahweh our God, Yahweh is Unique," is not one of these. In contrast to this, the command to love God in 6:5 is often repeated. It seems to be vital to Deuteronomic/Deuteronomistic theology, while the statements about Yahweh which are connected with it are never the same (cf. Dt. 5:9; 7:9; 10:14f., 17f., 21f.; 11:2-7; 13:6 [Eng. v. 5]; 30:20; Josh. 23:3). The demand for love is itself one of many formulations of the fundamental demand made on Israel to worship Yahweh alone and not any of the other gods (→ אהב *'āhabh*).[14] Here, there is probably a connection with the love motif in ancient Near Eastern treaties and royal letters.[15] Dt. 6, up to about v. 19, is an annotated rewriting of the beginning of the Decalog. In light of this, it seems that Dt. 6:4f. is to be regarded as a reiteration of the love motif in 5:10. Thus, the meaning of *'echadh* in 6:4 must be determined by the fundamental demand of Deuteronomy in general, and by the beginning of the Decalog in particular. On this basis, it affirms that Yahweh is the *one* and *only* God for *Israel.* The closest parallel to this in subject matter is Dt. 32:12: "Yahweh alone (*badhadh*) did lead him (Israel in the wilderness), and there was no foreign god with him." This does not deny the existence of other gods. Yahweh is *'echadh,* "one," with regard to the one who is addressed, viz., "Israel." In the ears of the contemporaries of the ones responsible for this statement, because of its direct connection with the love motif here, *'echadh* probably suggested emotional connotations, which this word can have in love lyrics when one refers to his sweetheart as the "only one": cf. Cant. 6:8f.[16] As the God whom Israel loves, Yahweh is Israel's *only one* and *unique one.* The late eschatological text, Zec. 14, which draws on diverse traditions, uses Dt. 6:4 in the middle (14:9). After the eschatological battle, Yahweh will be enthroned in Jerusalem as king of creation, and then "Yahweh will be unique and his name unique." Thus the statement in Dt. 6:4 is now given a universal application (cf. 14:16). *'echadh* is connected with the God-King motif (cf. Pss. 93, 97, 99; but also Dt. 10:17f.), as it is also once in Ugaritic literature.[17] Yahweh's "name" is to be understood in the sense of the Deuteronomistic theory of the presence of Yahweh in the Jerusalem temple (1 K. 8:27-29).[18]

Job 23:13 must be rejected as a proof for "one" God in the OT. The context demands a verb, cf. 9:12. Read *be'echodh* (infinitive from *'ḥz* I, as a dialectical variant of *'ḥd,* in which the *zayin* and the *daleth* are interchanged): "when he snatches away, who can hinder him?" In Dt. 6:4, *yhvh 'elohenu yhvh 'echadh* can be interpreted as two nominative sentences in sequence or as one nominative sentence with three different possibilities as to subject and predicate. In the Deuteronomic/Deuteronomistic material, *'elohenu,* "our God," is to be understood as in apposition to *yhvh,* "Yahweh," because when *'elohim* is used predi-

---

14 N. Lohfink, *Das Hauptgebot* (1963), 73ff.
15 W. L. Moran, *CBQ,* 25 (1963), 77ff.
16 On this, see G. Gerleman, *BK,* XVIII.
17 See II.1.c.
18 Further on Zec. 14, see III.2.c.

เนื้อหาคุ้มครองลิขสิทธิ์

a. According to 2 S. 7:23 = 1 Ch. 17:21, Israel is a "*unique* nation on earth" because of her deliverance from Egypt and because of her covenant relationship to Yahweh. According to one interpretation [20] which has recently been called in question, [21] 2 S. 7:22-24 is a Deuteronomistic addition to the ancient narrative of the Nathan oracle. [22]

'echadh in 2 S. 7:23 should not be corrected to *'acher*, "other," following the LXX. A phrase *goy 'acher ba'arets*, "other nation on the earth," would have to stand immediately after *umi*, "and who (what)," because in *mi* (who, what)-questions with comparisons, the words that come after *mi* and words that come after the comparison introduced by *ke* ("like, as") have different functions (cf. Mic. 7:18, where both positions are occupied).

b. The survivors of the fall of Jerusalem in 587 B.C. wrongly interpreted the idea that Abraham was *'echadh*, "one," as a guarantee of their security, and therefore this idea was rejected in Ezk. 33:24. But Deutero-Isaiah takes up this idea again in Isa. 51:2 as a motif of the hope of salvation.

c. Not earlier than in Chronicles, *'echadh* also appears in statements concerning the choice of the Davidides and of Jerusalem: 1 Ch. 29:1 (original in Chronicles–of Solomon) and 2 Ch. 32:12 (which is different from 2 K. 18:22, where *'echadh* does not occur–of the altar in Jerusalem).

d. A fugitive who was given to the service of the sanctuary [23] relates his prayer of asylum in Ps. 27:4: "*One thing* have I asked 'a hundred times' (read *me'ath*), [24] O Yahweh, that will I seek after: / that I may dwell in the house of Yahweh / all the days of my life. . . ."

2. *Original or Future Unity of Those Presently Divided.* In the OT, the picture of *unity and wholeness* either for the origin of history or for the future is drawn as contrast to the experience of disunity.

a. The *Yahwist* thinks of an original unity. In Gen. 2:21-24, he reproduces an etiology intended to explain the attraction of the sexes to each other, an etiology which had been handed down to him. It ends with the expression *basar 'echadh*, "one flesh," in 2:24, which appears again with its pre-Yahwistic meaning in Mal. 2:15 and Sir. 25:26. By adding Gen. 2:25 ("and the man and his wife were both naked, and were not ashamed"), J gives this narrative, with its affirmation of the original unity of mankind, a new function in the larger narrative framework. This unity is disrupted in 3:7, when the man and his wife realized that they were naked. The motif of "unity-division" is repeated after

---

20 Based on L. Rost, *Die Überlieferung von der Thronnachfolge Davids* (1926), 49.
21 By Noth, Labuschagne, Kutsch, Seybold.
22 On the use of the motif in Ezk. 37:22, see below, III.2.b.
23 L. Delekat, *Asylie und Schutzorakel am Zionheiligtum* (1967), 198.
24 M. Dahood, *AB, in loc.*

Éléments sous droits d'auteur

(an allusion to 2 S. 7:23) [29] with one king, "my servant David," "one shepherd for all of them." The *ro'eh 'echadh,* "one shepherd," of Ezk. 34:23 (again, "my servant David") is to be understood as a reflection of the theme of unity in Ezk. 37:15-28 (cf. the plural in the prototype in Jer. 23:4). [30] This external unity will be matched by an internal unity: Jer. 32:39, *lebh 'echadh vedherekh 'echadh,* "one heart and one way" (on the other hand, we must read *'acher* with the LXX in Ezk. 11:19). The Chronicler puts these statements about the future back into the idealized past: 1 Ch. 12:38f.; 2 Ch. 30:12.

c. Out of the *Jerusalem cult tradition* of the rule of the God of Zion was also developed the motif of the unity of creation which originated in Zion: Zeph. 3:9–the peoples (this should not be emended to *'ammi,* "my people") [31] serve Yahweh *shekhem 'echadh,* "shoulder to shoulder"="with one accord"; Isa. 65:25–the wolf and the lamb feed *ke'echadh,* "together" (cf. Isa. 11:6, *yachdav,* "together"); Zec. 14:7–in the eschatological age, there will no longer be the differences of day and night as in this world, but there will be *yom 'echadh,* "one day"="continuous day." [32] Zeph. 3:9 alludes to Gen. 11:1-9 (J) and Zec. 14:6-8 to Gen. 8:22 (J): thus, the End Time will be a restoration of the Primitive Age.

3. *Solitude As a Negative Factor.* When *'echadh* is used of the *individual* in contrast to several people or a group, it usually has a negative ring. In certain legal suits, the statement of one witness is not considered to be sufficient evidence: Nu. 35:30; Dt. 17:6; 19:15. Only one of the twelve tribes remains to the house of David (1 K. 11:13,32,36). Eccl. 4:7-12 deals with the theme of "the solitary man," partly in typical Koheleth wording and partly in traditional sayings. [33]

4. *Equality of Fate.* In Ex. 12:49; Nu. 9:14; 15:15; 16:22; Est. 4:11, *'echadh* is used to express the *equality of everyone* before the law in certain areas. Ezk. 48 uses this word as a leitmotiv to speak of the equality of all the tribes of Israel in the hereditary portion which they could expect to receive after the return from the exile. Negatively, the theme of the equality of everyone is found as a statement on human existence in Ecclesiastes. All men have *miqreh 'echadh,* "one fate," and *ruach 'echadh,* "the same breath" (3:19-21), for they all go to "one place" (3:20; 6:6), i.e., the Underworld. Ultimately, all the toil of man is for its mouth (6:7). [34] Therefore, everything is *hebhel,* "vanity" (2:15,17; 3:19; 6:4,9). Only one thing remains for man to do: to enjoy life now (2:24; 3:22; 9:7-10). This line of reasoning is also well documented from Egyptian and Mesopotamian literature.

---

[29] See III.1.a.
[30] W. Zimmerli, *BK,* XIII, 841, 917.
[31] Cf. G. Gerleman, *Zephanja* (1942), 58.
[32] See II.2 on Zec. 14:9.
[33] On parallels to Eccl. 4:12 in the Gilgamesh Epic, cf. B. Landsberger, *RA,* 62 (1968), 109.
[34] Cf. Ackroyd.

Éléments sous droits d'auteur

IV. Theologically Relevant Expressions Using 'echadh. *'echadh* is one element in certain *idioms* which are used in the OT in the context of theological statements.

a. "As one man" can express the unity of Israel: Nu. 14:15 (of a united effort to destroy a common foe); Jgs. 6:16; 20:1,8,11; 1 S. 11:7; 2 S. 19:15(14); Ezr. 3:1; Neh. 8:1.

b. "With one voice" in Ex. 24:3 expresses the idea that all Israel was involved in making the covenant with Yahweh (cf. Ex. 19:8, *yachdav*, "together").

c. "Not one" is used to emphasize that a certain work which God has done is complete: Ex. 8:27(31); 9:6,7; 10:19; 14:28; Josh. 23:14; Jgs. 4:16; 1 K. 8:56; Ps. 34:21(20); 106:11.

d. "In one day" expresses the swiftness of Yahweh's acts: Isa. 9:13(14); 10:17; 47:9; 66:8; Zec. 3:9; 2 Ch. 28:6.

Lohfink/Bergman (II.1.a)

אַחֵר *'achēr*

Contents: I. Occurrences, Meaning. II. The Expression "Other Gods."

I. Occurrences, Meaning. The word *'acher* occurs 161 times in the OT. Out of these, it occurs 62 times in the expression *'elohim 'acherim*, "other gods," mainly in Deuteronomy and Jeremiah.

'acher is a word which expresses relationship, and means "other, another" in relationship to something that is mentioned earlier in the text or is assumed. The type of relationship determines the exact meaning of the word. (a) The relationship can be such that *'acher* adds something to what is mentioned previously; here it can best be translated by "in addition, further, still," e.g., *zera' 'acher*, "another son" = "an additional son" (Gen. 4:25); *shibh'ath yamim 'acherim*, "seven additional days" (8:10,12); *'ohel 'acher*, "another tent" = "an additional tent" (2 K. 7:8); *keli 'acher*, "an additional vessel" (Jer. 18:4); *megillah 'achereth*, "an additional scroll, a further scroll" (36:28,32). This meaning can be made emphatic by the addition of *'odh*, "yet, again, besides," or *yasaph*, "to add," e.g., in Gen. 29:27,30; 30:24; 37:9. (b) *'acher* is also used when something mentioned or used earlier is replaced. Thus e.g., *beghadhim 'acherim* (Lev. 6:4 [Eng. v. 11]; 1 S. 28:8; Ezk. 42:14; 44:19) means "other garments,"

'achēr. Fr. J. Helfmeyer, *Die Nachfolge Gottes im AT. BBB*, 29 (1968), 130-182; C. Lindhagen, *The Servant Motif in the OT* (Uppsala, 1950), 120-142.

Éléments sous droits d'auteur

i.e., "different" from those used earlier; *keseph 'acher* (Gen. 43:22) means "other (different) money," as a substitute for that which had been mentioned previously. (c) With the definite article, *'acher* expresses a direct relationship to the first, and then "other" is to be taken in the sense of "second": *chatser ha'achereth,* "the second outer court" (1 K. 7:8); *hakkanaph ha'achereth,* "the other, second wing" (2 Ch. 3:12); in expressions of time, it assumes the meaning of "following, next," e.g., *bashshanah ha'achereth,* "in the following, next year" (Gen. 17:21); *bayyom ha'acher,* "on the following day" (2 K. 6:29). In expressions of time without the definite article, it means "future, coming," e.g., *dor 'acher,* "a future, coming generation" (Jgs. 2:10; Joel 1:3). (d) In some cases, *'acher* is used of something that is different: *ruach 'achereth,* "another (i.e., different) spirit" (Nu. 14:24); *'ish 'acher* is a man who is different and who behaves differently (1 S. 10:6); *lebh 'acher* means "a different heart" (10:9). When the difference is viewed negatively, *'acher* is synonymous with "foreign": *belashon 'achereth,* "with another tongue," i.e., in a foreign language (Isa. 28:11); *le'am 'acher,* "to a foreign people" (Dt. 28:32); *ben 'ishshah 'achereth,* "the son of a foreign woman (wife)" (Jgs. 11:2).

II. The Expression "Other Gods." The expression *'elohim 'acherim,* "other gods," is found in texts that are dominated by the idea of the covenant, especially in Deuteronomy (18 times), Jeremiah (18 times), and in texts like Josh. 23f. (3 times) and 2 K. 17 (4 times).

In this expression, *'acher* means first of all "additional," as is also indicated by the basic commandment: "You shall have no other (additional) gods besides me" (Ex. 20:3; Dt. 5:7). Thus, *'elohim 'acherim* includes all imaginable gods which Israel might possibly worship. But sometimes the nuances "different" and "foreign" are also present when a text speaks of "other gods," in other words, of gods which are foreign to Israel's covenant relationship with Yahweh. In three passages (Dt. 31:18,16; Josh. 24:2,23; Jgs. 10:13,16), *'elohim 'acherim* is clearly synonymous with *'elohe hannekhar,* "the foreign gods"; here "foreign" is not to be understood in an exclusively national (=alien) sense. In 1 S. 7:3f., the *be'alim* and the *'ashtaroth* ("the Baals and the Ashtaroth") are mentioned as examples of the *'elohe hannekhar,* "foreign gods." On the other hand, *'el zar* (Ps. 44:21[20]; 81:10[9]) seems to mean only "alien" gods.

'abhadh 'elohim 'acherim, "to serve other gods," is the most common expression in the OT for the idolatry of the nations. It occurs 34 times in the OT with Israel as the subject of "serve." Frequently the illegitimate *'ebhedh,* "service," of Israel is connected with *hishtachavah le,* "to bow down to (before)," which designates bowing down before the image of a god in the cult.[1] We also often find *halakh 'achare,* "to go (walk) after," with the foreign gods as the object. Originally, this expression could have referred to the worshippers actually going or walking after the image of the god in a cultic procession, but in the OT it is used as a more general term for the worship of idols.[2]

---

1 Cf. Zimmerli, *ThB,* 19 (1963), 237ff.

2 Cf. Helfmeyer, 130-151; → אחרי *'acharê*.

Materiál chráněný autorskými právy

Other verbs which are used with *'elohim 'acherim,* "other gods," are *panah,* "to turn to other gods" (Dt. 30:17; 31:18,20); *hizkir beshem,* "to mention the names of other gods in the cult" (Ex. 23:13; Josh. 23:7); *yare',* "to fear other gods" (2 K. 17:35,37f.); *zanah,* "to play the harlot after other gods" (Jgs. 2:17; cf. Ex. 34:15f.; Dt. 31:16). In this connection, the last verb assumes the marriage symbolism used for the covenant: the worship of other gods indicates that Israel has not been true to the marital fidelity which is demanded by the jealous God (*'el qanna'*), and therefore is harlotry.

Parallel to expressions which are used for the worship of other gods, frequently there are expressions which describe the consequences of idolatry for a person's relationship to Yahweh and his covenant. When someone serves other gods, he forgets (*shakhach*) Yahweh (Dt. 8:19; Jgs. 3:7), turns aside from following him (*shubh me'achare,* 1 K. 9:6; Josh. 22:16), forsakes (*'azabh,* Dt. 29:24f.[25f.]; Jer. 22:9), transgresses (*'abhar,* Dt. 17:2f.; Josh. 23:16), breaks (*hephar,* hiphil of *parar,* Gen. 17:14; Dt. 31:16,20; Jer. 11:10), or despises (*ma'as,* 2 K. 17:15f.) the covenant. [3]

All these expressions belong to the covenant concept. The prohibition against serving other gods assumes the covenant: Yahweh delivered Israel out of Egypt and by making the covenant with them made them a people for his own possession (*'am seghullah*) and a people holy to him (*'am . . . qadhosh leyhvh*) (Ex. 19:5f.; Dt. 7:6). The existence of the people wholly depends on Yahweh; thus he has an exclusive claim on their loyalty and worship.

When Israel serves other gods, they break this covenant which was made after the deliverance from Egypt (Dt. 29:25ff.[26ff.]; 31:20). The consequence they must suffer is a curse and death (Dt. 30:19); therefore, the non-Yahwistic cult must be destroyed with all its symbols (Dt. 7:5), and anyone who gives himself to idolatry must be punished by stoning him to death (Dt. 13:6ff.[5ff.]; 17:2ff.). It is also consistent with this concept when 2 K. 17 interprets the fall of the northern kingdom as being because the people of Israel feared other gods (v. 7), lived according to the customs of the Canaanites, and served idols (vv. 8,12). The one covenant God excludes the "other gods"; they are incompatible with him and with his covenant.

Erlandsson

---

[3] Cf. the synonyms of "following gods" in Helfmeyer, 152-182.

Materiál chráněný autorskými právy

אַחֲרֵי *'achᵃrê*

Contents: I. Secular Use: 1. Temporal Meaning; 2. Exclusively Local Meaning; 3. Local Meaning Indicating a Relationship; 4. Origin. II. Theological Use: 1. Scope; 2. Other Idioms Synonymous with *halakh 'achare;* 3. Following Other Gods; 4. Origin; 5. Following and Imitating.

I. Secular Use.

1. *Temporal Meaning.* The preposition *'achar* is used to express a temporal succession without implying any concrete relationship between what comes first and what follows (Gen. 9:28; 10:1,32; Lev. 14:43; Nu. 6:19; Jer. 40:1; Hos. 3:5; etc.). One exception to this is the phrase *zeraʿ 'achare,* which expresses a relationship between an ancestor of a tribe or clan and his descendants which goes beyond the exclusively natural and temporal succession. This phrase appears predominantly in covenantal texts which deal with the divine covenant with Noah, Abraham, and David (Gen. 9:9; 17:7,9,10,19; 35:12; 48:4; Dt. 1:8; 2 S. 7:12 = 1 Ch. 17:11). Here, temporal succession establishes not only a blood relationship, but a sort of shared destiny, in which the rights and obligations of the predecessor are transmitted to his successors.

2. *Exclusively Local Meaning.* Without a more precise statement of the relationship between what precedes and what follows, *'achare* refers to spatial sequence (Gen. 37:17; 1 S. 17:35; 2 K. 4:30; 2 Ch. 26:17; Ezk. 9:5; Ruth 2:9; etc.). In military contexts, one army follows after another (Ex. 14:23,28; 1 K. 20:19); in a round dance (Ex. 15:20), a religious procession (Neh. 12:38; Ps. 68:26 [Eng. v. 25]), and a funeral procession (2 S. 3:31), the participants follow "after" one another.

3. *Local Meaning Indicating a Relationship.* Various relationships are indicated by *'achare* in conjunction with *halakh,* "to go, walk," etc.: the relationship between a servant and his master (Isa. 45:14; Ps. 45:15 [14]; 49:18 [17]), between an army and its commander-in-chief (Jgs. 3:28; 4:14; 9:4; 1 S. 11:7; 17:13f.; 25:13), between a supporter and the cause or person he supports (Ex. 23:2; 2 S. 2:10; 15:13; 20:2,11,13,14; 1 K. 1:35,40; 2:28; 12:20; 16:21f.;

'achᵃrê. M. Buber, "Nachahmung Gottes," *Werke,* II (1964), 1053-1065; E. G. Gulin, "Die Nachfolge Gottes," *Festschrift K. Tallquist. StOr,* 1 (1925), 34-50; F. J. Helfmeyer, *Die Nachfolge Gottes im AT. BBB,* 29 (1968); *idem,* "'Gott nachfolgen' in den Qumrantexten," *RevQ,* 7 (1969), 81-104; G. Kittel, "ἀκολουθέω," *TDNT,* I, 210-16; H. Kosmala, "Nachfolge und Nachahmung Gottes II: im jüdischen Denken," *ASTI,* 3 (1964), 65-110; J. M. Nielen, "Die Kultsprache (Nachfolge und Nachahmung) im neutestamentlichen Schrifttum," *BiLe,* 6 (1965), 1-16; H. J. Schoeps, "Von der imitatio Dei zur Nachfolge Christi," *Aus frühchristlicher Zeit* (1950), 286-301; A. Schulz, *Nachfolgen und Nachahmen. StANT,* 6 (1962).

Materiál chráněný autorskými právy

ness of this following after Yahweh is expressed by describing it as following "with undivided heart" (1 K. 14:8), by contrasting it with the worship of other gods (1 K. 14:8; 18:21; context of 2 K. 23:3; context of Hos. 11:10), and by its opposition to any form of syncretism (esp. in 1 K. 18:21). Thus, a certain polemical, militant emphasis characterizes this term.

2. *Other Idioms Synonymous with halakh 'achare.* The meaning which we have ascertained for *halakh 'achare* also attaches to the expressions *hayah 'achare* (1 S. 12:14: exclusive worship of Yahweh based on the reference to the *tsidhqoth yhvh*, 12:7ff.), *mille' 'achare* ("to perform or carry out something while following Yahweh," Nu. 14:24; 32:12; Dt. 1:36; Josh. 14:8f.,14; Sir. 46:6,10: "following" here expresses the trust of Caleb and Joshua in Yahweh's promise; 1 K. 11:6: here "following" expresses the exclusive recognition of Yahweh), and *dabhaq 'achare* (Ps. 63:9[8]: "following" here means recognition of Yahweh's proprietary rights over Israel on the basis of Israel's election).

3. *Following Other Gods.* In contrast to the concept of "following" Yahweh, the OT speaks of "following" other gods (Dt. 4:3; 6:14; etc.),[6] expressed primarily through the cultic worship. This amounts to a violation of the demand to worship Yahweh alone which is connected with the first commandment, and to a violation of Yahweh's proprietary rights over Israel by virtue of the covenant. In this light, we can understand the polemic against following other gods in which the terminology and jurisdiction connected with the Yahweh war has been transferred to the battle against the other gods and their worship (→ אחר *'achēr*).

4. *Origin.* The elements of the Yahweh war in the context of the terminology of "following" in particular suggest that the theological use of this idea originated in the relationship between an army and its commander-in-chief. If so, this term is related to the divine titles *yhvh tsebhaoth,* "the Lord (Yahweh) of hosts," and *melekh,* "king," which in turn are closely connected with the ark of the covenant. Thus, originally to "follow" Yahweh may have meant to follow the ark as a symbol of leadership, palladium of war, Yahweh's throne, and processional shrine. That the tables of the law were kept in the ark may have been the reason that following Yahweh became linked with fulfilling the law, although here the focus is on Yahweh's proprietary relationship toward Israel.

It is most likely that Levitical circles are responsible for the terminology of following Yahweh, because it is quite prominent in Deuteronomic/Deuteronomistic literature, a warlike spirit is typical of these circles, and they prefer to use the parenetic diction to which this idiom belongs.

---

[6] For an exhaustive list of the passages, cf. Helfmeyer, 131-152.

Materiál chránený autorskými právy

5. *Following and Imitating.* Only scanty connections between following and imitating can be established in the OT. They are to be sought in particular in terminology of the "way," to which the concept of following also belongs. "To go (walk) in the way of someone" means "to imitate that person's actions," "to act like him." [7]

The meaning of "following" in the sense of "imitating" (albeit merely cultic "imitating," in the framework of worshipping other gods) is suggested by Lev. 20:2ff. (*zanah ʾachare,* "to play the harlot after"); Dt. 4:3 together with Hos. 9:10; Dt. 12:30; 2 K. 17:15a; Jer. 2:5; and Isa. 66:17. There is no passage in the OT that speaks of imitating Yahweh.

It is true that the demand for holiness (Lev. 19:2), and the motivation of commandments that deal primarily with social ethics and refer to the corresponding "exemplary" acts of God (Dt. 10:18f.; 15:15; etc.), supply substantial (but not terminological) points of contact with "imitating" Yahweh, but they are not connected with the concept of following him.

Helfmeyer

---

[7] F. Nötscher, *Gotteswege und Menschenwege in der Bibel und in Qumran. BBB,* 15 (1958), 43.

אַחֲרִית *ʾachᵃrîth*

Contents: I. The Word. II. 1. Temporal "After"; 2. Logical "After"; 3. Future; 4. Posterity, Remnant; 5. End. III. "End of the Days": 1. Some Future Time; 2. The End Time.

I. The Word. *ʾacharith* is derived from *ʾachar,* "later, afterwards" (as *she'erith* is derived from *she'ar,* and *re'shith* from *ro'sh*).[1] It is an abstract noun, which it is best to translate neutrally by "that which comes after,"[2] and not by "end, result," [3] which can be shown to be derived meanings. Without further modification, *ʾacharith* is what makes up that which comes after, as well as what results from a thing, a way, etc. From this general meaning come such modified meanings as "future, posterity, remnant, end," and "the last" (but not "back part"). [4] Sometimes the context has to determine the meaning of *ʾacharith;* by itself its meaning cannot be defined precisely. It has many shades of meaning, and occasionally scholars cannot agree on its exact meaning in a certain passage. Since there is nothing with which to compare this word and its usage in ancient Near Eastern literature, it is best to begin with those occurrences in the OT where its meaning is clear.

---

[1] *BLe,* § 61m'.
[2] Cf. W. Zimmerli, *BK,* XIII, on Ezk. 23:25.
[3] So recently *KBL*³.
[4] See below, 4.

Copyrighted material

Surely there is a *future,* and your hope will not be cut off" (Prov. 23:17f.); so similarly 24:14. We may add to this Isa. 46:9f.: "remember the former things of old; for . . . there is none like me, declaring the future (end) from the beginning and from ancient times things not yet done . . ." (in Isa. 41:22, *'acharonoth,* "the last things" [?], with 1QIs[a]). Jer. 29:11 says clearly: "I know the plans I have for you . . ., plans for *shalom* (welfare) and not for evil, to give you a future and a hope." But here again (as in 2. above), the uncertainty of the original meaning is made clear by the different shades of meaning which *'acharith* reflects. Thus, it cannot be determined with certainty whether it is better to translate it by "future" or "posterity" in Ps. 37:37; and even more perplexing is the use of *'acharith* in v. 38 (future, posterity, remnant?): "But transgressors (against Yahweh) shall be altogether destroyed; the *'acharith* of the wicked shall be cut off."

4. *Posterity, Remnant.* Thus "after(wards)" contains two other nuances: posterity and remnant. Clear examples of the meaning "posterity" are probably to be found in Ps. 109:13; Dnl. 11:4; Sir. 16:3. [8]

Ps. 109:13 says, "May his *'acharith* be cut off; may his (!) name be blotted out in the second generation." The context (vv. 9-12) speaks of the gradual rooting out of the sons of the accursed, but not of their death, so that presuppositions for the meaning "remnant" are not present, while the meaning "future" is excluded by the plural suffix in v. 13b. According to the reconstructed LXX prototype, Sir. 16:3 says: "Better is one (god-fearer) than a thousand, and to die childless than an *'acharith* of arrogance" (Heb., "than one who has many sons 'in contemptuousness' [read *bzlh*], and than an *'acharith* of arrogance"). Here *'acharith* cannot mean "end," but only "posterity," because an "end of arrogance" would be too subjective and insignificant in contrast to childlessness, which was a terrible condition for an Israelite. In light of this, the meaning of Dnl. 11:4 is probably also clear: "and when he has arisen, his kingdom shall be broken and divided toward the four winds of heaven, but not to his *'acharith*. . . ." Finally, Ezk. 23:25a should be mentioned here. While the captive Oholibah will have her nose and ears cut off, "your *'acharith* shall fall by the sword." This parable is speaking of Oholibah and her children. [9]

Clear examples for the meaning "remnant" are to be found in Am. 9:1; Nu. 24:20; Am. 4:2; and Ezk. 23:25b. [10]

In a supplement to the Balaam Sagas, we read in Nu. 24:20: "Amalek was the first of the nations, but his *'acharith* shall come to destruction." [11] Since this saying is based on the contrast between *re'shith,* "first," and *'acharith, 'acharith* can only mean the scanty remnant that is left after the splendid beginning. Am. 4:2b says: " . . . they shall take you (cows of Bashan) away with hooks, and your

---

8 Contra Rudolph, see below.
9 Cf. Zimmerli, *BK, in loc.*
10 On Am. 9:1, cf. H. Gese, *VT,* 12 (1962), 236f.
11 Do not read *'abhodh* with M. Noth, *Numbers. OTL* (trans. 1968), *in loc.*

Copyrighted material

means, "in the after(wards) of the days, in the following time"; cf. Akk. *ina aḫrāt ūmī*.[17] In Nu. 24:14 in particular it can be shown that the reference is to a limited future time.[18] Then, there is no reason to diverge from this meaning in Gen. 49:1; Dt. 4:30; and 31:29.[19] But in Jer. 49:39 also, the eschatological interpretation is not natural.[20] The best explanation of this verse seems to be that in the Persian Empire from the time of Darius I on, Elam blossomed forth again and thus its fate was changed.[21] Jer. 48:47 is missing in the LXX, perhaps because at the time this translation was made Moab no longer existed and its fate could no longer be changed. Although nothing is known with certainty about the postexilic history of Moab, it is better to interpret this passage in a noneschatological way with Rudolph than as an expectation of the end time, since there is hardly any evidence for this idea in Jeremiah. Jer. 23:20b=30:24b stands on the borderline between future and eschaton. *be'acharith hayyamim*, "in the end of the days" ("in the latter days"), the people will understand that Yahweh's wrath has not turned back from bursting upon the head of the wicked. In my opinion, the noneschatological interpretation is more natural here.

2. *The End Time.* However, there are six passages which should be interpreted differently. Among them Isa. 2:2=Mic. 4:1 are distinguished by their still not using the expression *be'acharith hayyamim* as an entirely technical term. On the other hand, it seems that the way it is used in Hos. 3:5 and Ezk. 38:16 opens the way for its development into a technical term, and in Dnl. 2:28 and 10:14 this development is complete. Thus, *be'acharith hayyamim* at the end of Hos. 3:5 is an obvious addition which locates the anticipated return of North Israel to Yahweh at the end of the days. This expression also clearly stands in an addition to Ezk. 38:16, which in turn is itself an addition to the original text:[22] "therefore, son of man, prophesy, and say to Gog (v. 14): ...you will come up against my people Israel, like a cloud covering the land. In the latter days I will bring you against my land, that the nations may know me, when through you, O Gog, I vindicate my holiness before their eyes" (v. 16). This expression is clearly used as a technical term in Dnl. 2:28 (Aramaic) and 10:14. In both passages the translation "future times" is possible, but it is not what the author intended. "(God in heaven) has made known to King Nebuchadnezzar what will be in the *'acharith* of the days" (2:28). The point of the vision does not lie in the course of future events, but in the destruction of the colossus and in the coming of an indestructible kingdom (v. 44). Thus the outcome of the future is what is intended, and not the future in general. Similarly, 10:14 says: "I (the angel that had appeared) came to make you understand what

---

17 *AHw*, 21.

18 M. Noth, *Numbers*, 192.; similarly on Ezk. 38:8, W. Zimmerli, *BK*, for the expression *'acharith hashshanim*.

19 So correctly G. von Rad, *Genesis. OTL* (trans. 1961), 417.

20 Rudolph, *HAT*, 12 (³1968), *in loc.*

21 Cf. C. Rietzschel, *Problem der Urrolle* (1966), 77f., on the assumption that this passage is not genuine.

22 Zimmerli, *BK, in loc.*

Copyrighted material

and nations) or *zāʾiru,* "enemy," in particular are used as synonyms of *ayyābu. raggu,* "evil," is used like *lemnu,* while adjectives like *damqu, ṭābu,* "good," occur frequently as antitheses to these.

Of theological interest are instances in which the king boasts of having destroyed the enemies of the land in obedience to the command of the gods.[2] In these instances, either a general word or the name of the hostile nation may be used. A group of royal epithets refers to this function of the king,[3] e.g., *kāšid ayyābēšu,* "the one who conquers his enemies";[4] *mukabbis kišād ayyābēšu,* "the one who tramples upon the neck of his enemies";[5] *mušamqit māt nakirīšu,* "the one who overcomes the land of his enemies";[6] etc. In the Psalms of Lament, the enemies could be national foes, personal adversaries, sorcerers, or demons; but their work is often described in such general terms that it is difficult or even impossible to determine their identity exactly.[7]

3. *Egypt.* In Egyptian, the most common word for "enemy," both personal and national, is *ḫfty,* literally, "the one who is against one"; but especially in late texts a whole group of synonymous expressions also appears. Of religious interest here also are references to the king as conqueror of enemies, especially because in this role he acts as a god and like the creator god casts down his enemies alone (the battle at Kadesh).[8] As representative of the god, he maintains the order of the world (*maʿat*) in this way.[9] The destruction of the enemies is also carried out cultically.[10] "The Egyptians make no fundamental distinction between mythical enemies of the gods and earthly enemies, i.e., political and criminal evildoers; both are simply 'enemies' in their language."[11] In temple inscriptions of the late period, more emphasis is placed on religion and ethics, so that the enemies are mainly "the evildoers," "the violent ones," etc.[12] The king is above all destroyer of *isf.t,* "sin, falsehood."[13] "Also quite often the old designations for 'enemies' of God or of the king are present—*bṯnw, ḫ3kw-ib, rkyw* . . . the extent to which they have been transferred from a mythical plane to a genuinely religious one remains an open question."[14]

The numerous passages in the funerary texts that speak of the enemies of the dead are of an entirely different type.[15] Here in the main the enemies are demons

---

2 Labat, 253ff.
3 Seux, 24.
4 *Ibid.,* 137f.
5 *Ibid.,* 123.
6 *Ibid.,* 158.
7 Widengren, 233ff.; cf. Mowinckel, 81ff.; Birkeland, *Feinde,* 350ff.
8 Erman, *Literature of the Ancient Egyptians* (trans. 1927), 261-270; Hornung, 146.
→ אחר *ʾechadh.*
9 Hornung, 18.
10 *Ibid.,* 17.
11 *Ibid.*
12 Otto, 24f., 36f.
13 *Ibid.,* 83ff.
14 *Ibid.,* 45.
15 Zandee, 217ff.

Material chroniony prawem autorskim

yachshebu raʿah li, "to imagine the worst for someone," Ps. 41:6,8[5,7]), sound almost like a definition of *ʾoyebh. ʾohebh,* "friend" (Jgs. 5:31), *ʾalluph meyuddaʿ,* "familiar (intimate) friend" (Ps. 55:14[13]), and *reaʿ,* "neighbor" (Lam. 1:2), appear in antithesis to *ʾoyebh.*

The meaning of *ʾoyebh* can be determined further by analyzing the verbs which describe the work of the *ʾoyebh,* e.g., *hetsiq,* "to oppress" (Dt. 28:53,55,57), *tsarar,* "to oppress" or "be hostile to" (1 K. 8:37, etc.), *naghaph,* "to smite, strike" (Lev. 26:17; Nu. 14:42; Dt. 1:42; 1 K. 8:33 = 2 Ch. 6:24), *nakhah,* hiphil "to smite" (Jer. 30:14), *radhaph,* "to pursue, persecute" (Hos. 8:3; Ps. 31:16[15]; 143:3), *baghadh,* "to deal treacherously with, deceive" (Lam. 1:2). Furthermore, the proud behavior of the enemies is often mentioned: they exalt themselves (Ps. 13:3[2]), make themselves great (Lam. 1:9), scoff and revile (Ps. 74:10,18; Lam. 1:21; Ezk. 36:2), they rejoice (Lam. 2:17), open wide their mouths, i.e., rail (2:16; 3:46), gnash with their teeth (2:16), etc.

3. *Theological Use.* From a theological point of view (esp. in the Deuteronomistic history) the attacks of enemies on Israel are manifestations of divine punishment for Israel's apostasy. God gives the Israelites into the hand of their enemies (Jer. 21:7; 34:20f.); they will be smitten by their enemies (Dt. 1:42; 1 K. 8:33); they must even go into the land of their enemies (1 K. 8:46), and serve their enemy in his land (Jer. 17:4).

On the other hand, Yahweh can fight for Israel and thrust out her enemies (Dt. 6:19; 33:27). The passage concerning the ark in Nu. 10:35 states that when God arises, his enemies are scattered (cf. Ps. 68:2[1]). Several passages in the OT speak of the vengeance of Israel or of God on their enemies (Josh. 10:13; Jgs. 11:36; 1 S. 14:24; 18:25; Isa. 1:24). God saves (*yashaʿ, hitstsil*) his people from their enemies (Jgs. 2:18; 8:34; 1 S. 12:10; 2 S. 3:18; 22:1; 2 K. 17:39; cf. also Nu. 10:9). At some future time, he will bring back the scattered Israelites from the land of their enemies (Jer. 31:16; Ezk. 39:27). According to the Deuteronomistic point of view, the ideal is for Israel to have rest (→ מנוחה *mᵉnûchāh*) from her enemies (Dt. 12:10; 25:19; Josh. 23:1; 2 S. 7:1,11; cf. 1 Ch. 22:9).

4. *Personal Enemies.* Some passages speak of one's relationship to personal enemies. If the ox or ass of a person's enemy goes astray or is weary, he shall help it (Ex. 23:4f.). The instructions concerning killing in Nu. 35:16-34 make a distinction between killing with a hostile intention ("in order to do him *raʿah* [harm]," parallel to "out of hate" or "in enmity," *sinʾah,* vv. 20f.) and without such an intention, "without enmity" or "though he was not his enemy" (*vehuʾ loʾ ʾoyebh lo,* vv. 22f.). Prov. 24:17 says: "Do not rejoice when your enemy falls," but this saying is rather unique in the OT.

5. *God As Enemy.* The enemies of Israel are also the enemies of Israel's God (1 S. 30:26; 2 S. 12:14); Yahweh intervenes to fight them. Accordingly, God promise Israel in Ex. 23:22 that if they hearken to him he will be an enemy to their enemies and an adversary to their adversaries.

Material chroniony prawem autorskim

It is unprecedented when in Lam. 2:4f. God is accused of appearing as an enemy against his people: "he has bent his bow like an enemy . . . and put to death like a foe . . . Yahweh has become like an enemy, he has destroyed Israel." Similarly, Trito-Isaiah says that God has become Israel's enemy because of the disobedience of the people (Isa. 63:10).

III. The Problem of Enemies in the Psalms. A somewhat different picture, or at least a much more complex picture, appears in the Psalms. Here, especially in the Songs of Lamentation and of Thanksgiving, there are references to enemies in which a psalmist laments the work of the enemies or gives thanks to God for their defeat. In psalms where the nation is the subject, it is natural to think that the enemies are external, national enemies, while in Individual Psalms the identification of the enemies is very difficult to determine. It is advisable to deal with the National Psalms and the Individual Psalms separately.

1. *National Psalms and Royal Psalms.* As far as the national enemies are concerned,[18] there is no basic difference between psalms in which the subject is "we" and psalms in which the king speaks in the name of the people. The relevant passages for a discussion of *'oyebh* in this sense are Ps. 18:4,18,38,41,49 (3,17,37,40,48); 21:9(8); 61:4(3); 89:23,43(22,42); 110:2; 132:18 (Royal Psalms), or 44:17(16); 74:3,10,18; 80:7(6) (National Psalms of Lamentation); add to this 1 S. 2:10 in Hannah's Song of Praise. The synonyms of *'oyebh* which occur in these passages[19] are *sone'* or *mesanne'*, "one who hates," Ps. 21:9(8); 44:8,11 (7,10); 89:24 (23); *tsar,* "oppressor," 44:6,8,11(5,7,10); *qam,* "assailant," 18:40, 49(39,48); *mithnaqqem,* "avenger," 44:17(16). In several instances the enemies are explicitly designated as foreigners: *goyim,* "nations," 18:44(43); 79:1,6,10; *'ammim,* "peoples," 18:48(47); *bene nekhar,* "foreigners," 18:45f.(44f.); 144:7,11.

It is often said in these passages that the national enemies do not seek or worship Yahweh (14:1f.,4; 28:5; 44:17[16]; 58:4[3]; 74:10,18; 79:6,10,12), therefore they are Yahweh's enemies (74:4,18,22f.; 83:3,6[2,5]; 89:52[51]; 1 S. 2:10). They are characterized by their pride, which expresses itself especially in arrogant words (Ps. 12:4f.[3f.]; 18:28[27]; 1 S. 2:3) and scoffings (44:17[16]; 74:10,18; 79:10,12; 89:52[51]). Their corruption is depicted with designations like *resha'im,* "wicked" (28:3; 58:4[3]; 125:3; 1 S. 2:9), *po'ale 'aven,* "evildoers" (14:4; 28:3; 125:5), *'anshe chamas,* "men of violence" (18:49[48]), *ben 'avlah,* literally "son of injustice," so "wicked" (89:23[22]), and *dobhere khazabh,* "speakers of lies" (58:4[3]). Thus, theologically the "enemies of the people" are regarded as "enemies of God." For this reason, one prays for help against them, and the king receives the promise that he will triumph over them.

2. *Individual Psalms.* In the Individual Psalms, *'oyebh* occurs in the following passages: 3:8(7); 6:11(10); 7:6(5); 9:4,7(3,6); 13:3,5(2,4); 17:9; 25:2,19; 27:2, 6; 30:2(1); 31:9,16(8,15); 35:19; 38:20(19); 41:3,6,12(2,5,11); 42:10(9); 43:2;

---

18 Birkeland, *Feinde,* 23-66.
19 *Ibid.,* 60-62.

described in the same categories. The important thing is not the precise description of the enemies, but the theological classification of their work as contrary to God and chaotic. Beyond this, it is possible in some passages that the worshipper is a king on whom the fate of the land rests.

3. *Present Status of the Debate.* The enemies in the Individual Psalms of Lament have been interpreted quite variously. Duhm[24] and to some extent Kittel[25] thought they were political and religious adversaries of the godly in the Maccabean Period; Puukko still thinks so.[26] Balla expresses himself only briefly on the problem of the identity of the enemies in the psalms;[27] but since he defends the thesis that the "I" in the psalms is an individual, he also identifies the enemies as the personal adversaries of the worshipper, perhaps the ungodly, who are also enemies of God and enemies of the godly who still believe in God.[28] Gunkel-Begrich favor an interpretation that allows for a wider diversity of meaning.[29] Mowinckel thinks that the enemies were primarily sorcerers (*poʿale* → אוֹן *ʾāven*), who persecuted the worshipper and sought to harm him by their magical arts. On the contrary, Birkeland maintains that since the enemies in the Individual Psalms of Lament are described with the same words as in the "National" Psalms, they must be external national enemies everywhere in the psalms: in the Individual Psalms, the king may be the worshipper, or the situation may be that of an individual in distress because of war. On the basis of his comparisons of the OT psalms with the Akkadian Psalms of Lament, Widengren emphasizes that the same expressions can be used differently in different contexts, and that stereotyped phrases by no means justify a uniform explanation of the enemies; rather, in each individual case one must make his investigation on the basis of other criteria in order to determine those to whom the expressions refer.

Ringgren

---

24 Duhm, *KHC*, XIV (²1922).
25 Kittel, *KAT*, XIII (³⁻⁴1922).
26 Puukko, *OTS*, 8 (1950), 47-65.
27 Balla, 19ff., 125f.
28 *Ibid.*, 26.
29 Gunkel-Begrich, 196-211.

مادة محمية بموجب حقوق النشر

2. *Religious Significance.* The basic meaning of *'emah* may be seen in Hab. 1:7. To be sure, it is the Chaldeans who spread abroad terror here. But if according to v. 6 Yahweh is the one who rouses the Chaldeans, and in v. 5 the Israelites are summoned to "wonder and be astounded" (→ תמה *tāmah,* hithpael, qal), then it is clear that Yahweh produces this terror by means of a military invasion, a terror which is expressed by wonder and astonishment. Dt. 32:25 contains a similar idea. Because he is angry with his people, Yahweh smites them with afflictions of war (vv. 19-24), which are summed up in v. 25: "in the open the sword shall bereave, and in the chambers shall be terror." Again, Yahweh is the actor who is responsible for this situation through military invasion, and the *'emah* is equivalent to a deadly weapon. The personification of terror to be observed here also appears in Ps. 88:16(15); Job 9:34; 13:21; 33:7; and most clearly in Ex. 23:27 (J). Yahweh dismisses the people with the promise: "I will send my terror before you." Like the "angel" (v. 20) and "fear" (v. 28), so here terror appears as an independent entity. It acts at Yahweh's instruction, brings about the confusion and flight of Israel's enemies (v. 27), and thus mediates the delivering immanence and protecting presence of Yahweh to his people.

The content of the statements found in Ex. 15:16; Josh. 2:9 (J); and Gen. 15:12 (J) is similar to that which occurs in these passages, but they have a different form. According to Ex. 15, "terror and dread" (*'emethah vaphachadh,* → פחד *pachadh;* so also 1QpHab 3:4; 4:7; 1QS 1:17; 10:15) fall upon the Edomites, Moabites, and Canaanites (v. 15), and cause them not merely to "tremble" (v. 14), "be dismayed" and "melt away" (v. 15), but "to be still as a stone" (v. 16). In this context, there is no explicit reference to Yahweh, and *'emah* is construed with *naphal 'al,* "to fall upon." In Josh. 2, the Canaanites also melt away before Israel because of the terror. Terror falls upon Abraham (Gen. 15) to prepare him for the theophany and the promise which follow (vv. 17f.). The fact that Yahweh acts here also, and that the *'emah* is "in terror and bewilderment," [5] or in fear, confusion, and numbness, connects Gen. 15:12 with the other two passages. But Gen. 15 differs from them in that the setting is not warlike, and the terror does not fall on Israel's adversaries, but on the Israelite Abraham.

This use of the word is very near that found in Ps. 55:5(4); 88:16(15); Job 9:34; 13:21; 20:25; 33:7, all of which are concerned with an individual Israelite. The worshipper in the two Individual Songs of Lament describes his distress in this way: "the terrors of death have fallen upon me," "fear" (→ יראה *yir'āh*) and "trembling" come upon me (Ps. 55:5f.[4f.]), and he says that he had suffered Yahweh's terrors (Ps. 88:16[15]). Job wishes that God would take away his physical suffering, that "his terror" would not "fall upon" (*ba'ath,* piel) him (Job 9:34; 13:21). Zophar expresses his belief in the threatening judgment on evildoers with the statement, "terrors come upon him" (20:25), and Elihu replies to Job in these words: "behold, the fear of me shall not dismay you" (33:7).

In Ezk. 42:16, it is preferable to read *me'oth,* "hundreds," with the *qere* than the MT *'emoth,* "terrors"; and in Ezr. 3:3 it is better to read *be'ebhah,* "in enmity," than the MT *be'emah,* "in fear." Some scholars have suggested

---

5 Von Rad, *Genesis. OTL* (trans. 1961), 182.

مادة محمية بموجب حقوق النشر

אִישׁ *ʾîsh;* אִשָּׁה *ʾishshāh*

Contents: I. 1. Etymology, Occurrences; 2. Use. II. Secular Use: 1. *ʾish;* 2. *ʾishshah.* III. Theological Considerations: 1. Anthropological Concepts; 2. Specifically Theological Concepts; 3. As a Medium of Revelation.

I. 1. *Etymology, Occurrences.*

a. The etymology of *ʾish* is uncertain: one root which has been suggested, *ʾyš, ʾwš,* "to be strong," [1] cannot be verified, and the meaning of another root which has been proposed, *ʾnš,* [2] is not settled (Arab. *aṯṯa,* "to sprout up abundantly"?). [3] Elliger thinks the noun *ʾish* comes "from the root *ʾšš* which has come to light in the Habakkuk Commentary from the Dead Sea literature (VI, 11)" [4] (if so, *hith'oshash* means "to take courage," "to act like men" [Isa. 46:8; cf. 1 S. 4:9], and is a denominative from *ʾish*). In connection with this, we should mention the Old South Arabic words *ʾys, ʾs,* "man, one, each," [5] and especially Ugar. *ʾš.* [6] It is possible that *ʾish* is a primary noun which is not based on a verbal root. In the OT this word is found in the singular and the plural, and occurs here 2160 times according to *KBL.*

b. The etymology of *ʾishshah* is also uncertain. It is usually derived from the root *ʾnš,* "to be sick, weak"; we are probably dealing with a primary noun here also. The connection between *ʾishshah* and *ʾish* which is made in Gen. 2:23 is probably to be interpreted as a popular etymology, because *ʾishshah* is certainly

---

ʾîsh. P. J. Bratsiotis, Ἡ γυνή ἐν τῇ βίβλῳ (Athens, ²1940), 13-25; N. P. Bratsiotis, Ἀνθρωπολογία τῆς Παλαιᾶς Διαθήκης, I (Athens, 1967), 24-39, 49-52, 140-151; A. Gonzáles, "Hombre de Dios," *CultBibl,* 120/21 (1954), 143-48; A. Haldar, *Associations of Cult Prophets among the Ancient Semites* (Uppsala, 1945), 126-28; R. Hallevy, "Man of God," *JNES,* 17 (1958), 237-244; J. Hempel, "Gott, Mensch und Tier im AT," *BZAW,* 81 (1961), 198-229; G. Hölscher, *Die Profeten* (1914), 127; H. Junker, *Prophet und Seher in Israel* (1927), 77f.; *idem, Genesis. EB,* I (²1955), 28f.; W. C. Klein, "The Model of a Hebrew Man. The Standards of Manhood in Hebrew Culture," *BiblRes,* 4 (1960), 1-7; E. König, *Genesis* (²,³1925), 217-220; J. Lindblom, *Prophecy in Ancient Israel* (Oxford, 1962), 60ff.; N. W. Porteous, "Man, Nature of, in the OT," *IDB,* III, 242-46; O. Procksch, *KAT*²⁻³, I, 28f.; R. Rendtorff, "Προφήτης, B. נביא in the OT," *TDNT,* VI, 796-812; J. Scharbert, *Heilsmittler im AT und im Alten Orient. QuaestDisp,* 23/24 (1964), 138f., 280ff.; H. V. Schwarz, "Das Gottesbild des Propheten Oseas," *BiLi,* 35 (1961/62), 274-79; A. van Selms, "De uitdrukking 'Man van God' in de Bybel," *Hervormde Teologiese Studies,* 15 (1959), 133-149; de Vaux, *AncIsr;* C. Westermann, "Propheten," *BHHW,* III, 1496-1512; H. W. Wolff, *Hosea* (trans. 1974).

1 *KBL*¹.
2 *KBL*².
3 Baumgartner.
4 K. Elliger, *Festschrift Alt* (1953), 100f.
5 W. W. Müller, *ZAW,* 75 (1963), 306.
6 Cf. *OLZ,* 62 (1967), 537; Gröndahl, *PNU,* 102.

مادة محمية بموجب حقوق النشر

related to Arab. *ʾunṯā* (cf. Ugar. *ʾṯt*, "woman," and *tʾnṯt*.).[7] *ʾishshah* is found in the singular and the plural (*nashim*) in the OT, and occurs here 775 times according to *KBL*.

2. *Use*. The word *ʾish*, which in a characteristic way is used not only with reference to man, but also to God and even to animals, appears in all aspects of human life, where it usually has a secular sense, and only rarely a theological one. In comparison with other terms that have a similar meaning, *ʾish* manifests a rich variety of nuances. The principal meanings are "man," "husband," and "mankind."

The variety of meanings also appears where *ʾish* occurs as a parallel to or possibly even as a synonym of other terms,[8] especially of → אדם *ʾādhām*, → אנוש *ʾᵉnôsh*, and → גבר *gebher*, and also → זכר *zākhār* and → בעל *baʿal*. Since *ʾish* is found almost uniformly both in OT literature (including Sir.) and in the ancient Hebrew inscriptions, it is impossible to speak of an earlier or later use of this word, as can be done with some combinations of words.[9] The same also applies to *ʾishshah*.[10]

II. Secular Use.

1. *ʾish*. The various examples of *ʾish* come mainly from the secular sphere. We can get a clear picture of the various meanings by the following analysis.

a. *ʾish* means "man": first, as a term denoting sex, used in contrast to *ʾishshah*, "woman," to designate the one who begets (Eccl. 6:3), or a newborn male child (Gen. 4:1); second, as a term denoting that a person is an adult man in contrast to *yeledh*, "young man" (4:23), or to *naʿar*, "youth" (1 S. 17:33), but also in contrast to → זקן *zākhēn*, "old man" (2:32f.); third, as a term used to emphasize masculine qualities such as manliness in contrast to *ʾishshah*, in fact used in parallelism with *gebher*, "man" (Jer. 22:30; 23:9), or such as bravery (1 S. 4:9; 1 K. 2:2; cf. 1 S. 26:15). Physical or spiritual qualities are often expressed by the use of *ʾish* in the construct, e.g., *ʾish saʿir*, "a hairy man," in contrast to *ʾish chalaq*, "a smooth man" (Gen. 27:11); *ʾanshe middoth*, "men of great stature" (Nu. 13:32); *ʾish toʾar*, "a man of good presence" (1 S. 16:18); *ʾish chesedh*, "a man who is kind" (Prov. 11:17); *ʾish shalom*, "a man of peace" (Ps. 37:37); *ʾish tebhunah*, "a man of understanding" (Prov. 17:27); *ʾanshe ʾemeth*, "men who are trustworthy" (Ex. 18:21; Neh. 7:2); fourth, as a term to designate an office, a profession, and a rank held by men: *ʾish kohen*, "priest" (Lev. 21:9); *ʾish sar*, "prince" (Ex. 2:14); *ʾish saris*, "eunuch" (Jer. 38:7); *ʾish sadheh*, "a man of the field" (Gen. 25:27); *ʾanshe miqneh*, "keepers of the cattle" (46:32); *ʾish milchamah*, "a man of war" (Josh. 17:1; cf. Nu. 31:49; Dt. 2:14; Josh. 5:6; Joel

---

7 *BiOr*, 23 (1966), 132.
8 See below.
9 See below.
10 For further discussion of this, see below.

مادة محمية بموجب حقوق النشر

2:7); *ʾish chayil,* "valiant men" (Jgs. 3:29; 1 S. 31:12; 2 S. 24:9; 1 K. 1:42); fifth, as a term used to indicate that one was of a certain nationality: *ʾish mitsri,* "an Egyptian" (Gen. 39:1); *ʾish ʿibhri,* "a Hebrew" (Ex. 2:11); or of a certain tribe: *ʾish levi,* "a certain Levite" (Jgs. 19:1); *ʾish ʾephrayim,* "men of Ephraim" (8:1); or to indicate inhabitants of a land: *ʾanshe haʾarets,* "the men of the land" (Lev. 18:27); of a city: *ʾanshe haʿir,* "the men of the city" (Jgs. 19:22); of a house: *ʾanshe bethah,* "the men of her household" (Gen.39:14); sixth, with the meaning "someone, one" (13:16); "each" (40:5).

b. *ʾish* means "husband" (Gen. 29:32; Nu. 30:7ff. [Eng. vv. 6ff.]; 1 S. 1:8; 25:19; Jer. 29:6; Ezk. 16:45; Prov. 7:19): in contrast to *ʾishshah,* "wife" (Gen. 16:3; Lev. 21:7; Nu. 30:7ff.[6ff.]; Jgs. 13:6), and as a parallel to → בעל *baʿal,* "husband" (2 S. 11:26; cf. Dt. 24:3f.).

c. *ʾish* means "mankind" (esp. in Jgs. 9:49b, where *ʾish,* "mankind" [pl.] is used alongside *ʾish,* "man," and *ʾishshah,* "woman"): as a designation for the species "man," which includes "man" and "woman," and appears in both the secular and the religious sphere; thus *ʾanshe qodhesh,* "men consecrated" (Ex. 22:30[31]); *ʾerets loʾ ʾish,* "a land where no man is" (as parallel to *midhbar,* "desert," Job 38:26). *ʾish* is also used as a parallel to *ʾenosh* and as a synonym of *ʾadham* (Isa. 2:9,11,17; 31:8; Jer. 2:6; Prov. 6:12; cf. Ps. 22:7[6]; Prov. 30:2) or of *ben ʾadham,* "son of man" (Nu. 23:19; Isa. 52:14; cf. 2 S. 7:14), and *ben ʾish* is used synonymously with *ben ʾadham* (Jer. 49:18,33; 50:40; Ps. 62:10[9]). It is still uncertain, however, whether *bene ʾish* is used in Ps. 4:3(2); 49:3(2); and Lam. 3:33 as a parallel to or in contrast to *bene ʾadham.* Finally, *ʾish* sometimes has the meaning "human" (*ʾammath ʾish,* "cubit of a man"="human cubit," Dt. 3:11) or "usual" or "common" (*shebhet ʾanashim,* "rod of men"="common rod," 2 S. 7:14).

2. *ʾishshah.* The different uses of *ʾishshah* are divided between the two basic meanings "woman" and "wife." [11]

a. *ʾishshah* means "woman" in contrast to *ʾish,* "man," [12] i.e., first, *ʾishshah* in the absolute, Eccl. 7:26 (the feminine sex); *ʾorach kannashim,* "the manner of women" (Gen. 18:11); *derekh nashim,* "the way of women" (Gen. 31:35); *ʾahabhath nashim,* "the love of women" (2 S. 1:26); second, with an adjective or in the construct as a term used to designate rank and characteristics: *ʾishshah gedholah,* "a wealthy woman" (2 K. 4:8); *ʾishshah zonah,* "a harlot" (Josh. 2:1; 6:22; Jer. 3:3); *ʾesheth zenunim,* "a wife of harlotry" (Hos. 1:2); *ʾishshah zarah,* "a loose (strange) woman" (Prov. 2:16; 5:3,20; 7:5); *ʾesheth chayil,* "a woman of worth" (Ruth 3:11; Prov. 12:4; 31:10); third, in the sense of "each" (Ruth 1:8,9).

---

[11] Cf. above, II.1.a,b.
[12] See above, II.1.a.

مادة محمية بموجب حقوق النشر

b. *ʾishshah* means "wife" in contrast to *ʾish*, "husband." Here belong the following expressions which have to do with the man-woman relationship, mostly with regard to sex: *ʾishshah*, "fiancée" (Dt. 22:24) or "bride" (Gen. 29:21); *nathan lo leʾishshah*, "(she) gave him (her maid) as a wife" (30:4,9); *laqach lo ʾishshah*, "he took to himself a wife" (4:19; 6:2; cf. Ex. 21:10); *vattehi lo leʾishshah*, "and she became his wife" (1 S. 25:43); *ʾishshah bheʿulath baʿal*, "the wife of another man" (Dt. 22:22); *ʾesheth ʾish*, "a man's wife" (Prov. 6:26); *ʾesheth neʿurim*, "a wife of youth" (Isa. 54:6; Prov. 5:18); and *ʾesheth ʿazubhah*, "a wife forsaken" (Isa. 54:6).

c. It is worthy of note that fainthearted or cowardly men are characterized as "women" (Jer. 51:30; 50:37; Isa. 19:16; Nah. 3:13). Moreover, the death of a man was considered to be dishonorable if it was at the hand of a woman. Therefore, the severely wounded Abimelech urged his armorbearer to kill him lest it be said, "a woman killed him" (Jgs. 9:54; cf. also 4:9).

III. Theological Considerations.

1. *Anthropological Concepts.* Some passages in the OT may be interpreted anthropologically. These are passages where *ʾish* appears as a synonym of *ʾadham* and *ʾenosh*, and where there is an indication of a differentiation of human nature.

a. First of all, man is distinguished from God. This appears in the use of *ʾish* in contrast to → אלהים *ʾelōhîm*, "God" (Gen. 32:29[28]); but also in contrast to → יהוה *yhvh*, "Yahweh, the Lord" (Isa 2:11,17; cf. Sir. 10:7). The relationship between man and God, and the differentiation of human nature from God, are determined by God's creation of man on the one hand, and by the OT belief that all human nature is "in his hand" on the other (*beyadho . . . veruach kol besar ʾish*, "in his hand . . . is the breath of all mankind," Job 12:10).[13] Man is conscious of God's vast superiority. The pride of man is humbled before the exalted magnificence of God (Isa. 2:11,17). Thus, the question is asked, "Who has directed the Spirit of the Lord, or as his counselor has instructed him?" (*ʾish ʿatsatho*, Isa. 40:13).

b. But man is also distinguished from animals. This is especially emphasized when *ʾish* is contrasted with → בהמה *bᵉhēmāh* (as in Ex. 11:7; 19:13; Lev. 20:15; cf. Ps. 22:7[6]). Such passages express the OT belief that in spite of the many affinities between man and beasts (cf. Gen. 2:19a with 2:7a), there is still a clear distinction between human and animal nature. This is even clearer in passages that impose the death penalty for the transgression of sexual intercourse (Ex. 22:18[19]) between an *ʾish* (Lev. 20:15) or an *ʾishshah* (18:22; 20:16) and a *behemah*, "beast." A theological reason for this is found in the ancient narrative of the creation of man (Gen. 2:7), both male and female (2:18,20bff.), and of the

---

13 For certain passages that make a strong distinction between man and God, see below, III.2.a.

Copyrighted material

animals (2:19f.). It appears as if the creation of the beasts interrupts the whole process of the creation of man. But actually the writer is trying to emphasize the difference between man and beast, and man's position of dominion over the beasts (2:20; cf. v. 19). The beasts do not fulfil the God-given need of man for a partner (2:18,20), and cannot take away his loneliness. Therefore God "builds" (→ בנה *bānāh*) the woman. Thus the nature of man is different from that of animals, which cannot stand by man's side (2:21f.), but are "put under his feet" (Ps. 8:7ff.[6ff.]; cf. Gen. 2:18f.; 1:26,28). Everything that perverts such a relationship between man and beast is rejected. This explains why fornication with animals is considered to be unnatural (Lev. 18:23): it opposes the arrangement ordained by God in the creation of man, and is offensive to the significance of the existence of one's fellow man and especially of the woman (cf. Gen. 2:18,20b).

c. In addition to the external differentiation of man from God and beasts, the OT also speaks of an internal distinction within mankind, but only with regard to the sexual difference between an *'ish,* "a male," and an *'ishshah,* "a female." Gen. 2:18,20bff. develop this distinction. The well-thought-out choice of words (cf. in 2:7a, *min ha'adhamah–'adham,* "from the ground–man"; v. 23b, *me'ish–'ishshah,* "from the man–woman") in the entire narrative (2:4bff.) must be interpreted by theological exegesis. Thus, 2:23 is of fundamental importance, because on the one hand here *'ish* is used for the first time in this narrative, and on the other hand *'ishshah* is explained, indeed one may even say, is defined here. In 2:23, *'ish* and *'ishshah* appear only once apiece (in all likelihood this is deliberate), and both words are spoken by *'adham,* "man," himself. After the "deep sleep" (*tardemah*) which God brought on the *'adham,* for the first time he meets the woman whom God brought to him (2:22), and for the first time he becomes aware of standing in the presence of a fellow creature not merely with the same nature but also of a different sex (2:23a). Previously he had inspected the animals and recognized that he had a different nature and thus came to realize that he was a human being, but now he also realizes that he is of a different sex from the *'ishshah,* "woman," and thus recognizes the peculiarity of his being a "man" (*me'ish*). Therefore, he is *'ish,* and she is *'ishshah.* To express it more precisely, according to 2:23a *'adham,* "the man," characterizes the creature who stands before him as *zo'th,* "this (one, feminine)," apparently in order to establish a blood relationship and thus to emphasize that they are of the same nature, i.e., by using *zo'th* he recognizes that she is a fellow creature. Now for him *zo'th* is an *'ishshah.* But at the same time he also recognizes their mutual relationship (*'ishshah me'ish,* "woman from man"), as well as the position of both in creation. Therefore, it is worthy of note that *zakhar,* "male," and *neqebhah,* "female," which serve only to denote a person's sex, are not used here, as they are in 1:27, but rather *'ish* and *'ishshah.* While these words also mean "husband" and "wife" respectively, they also indicate their position in creation as well as their relationship to and with each other. Thus, by using the expression *'ishshah me'ish,* which calls attention to the striking similarity between the Hebrew words for "man" and "woman," the narrator seems to want

Copyrighted material

to emphasize the identity of the nature of, and the "equality" of, man and woman. [14]

d. Taken strictly, neither *ʾishshah* nor *ʾish* appears in Gen. 2 as a proper name. For a while, *ʾishshah* serves only as a designation for the sole female human being, because not until after the Fall does the woman receive a proper name–Eve (Gen. 3:20). After establishing that there is a fellow creature for man, the narrator uses *ʾadham*, "Adam," as the man's proper name (so in 2:25, *haʾadham veʾishto*, "Adam and his wife," cf. 3:8,12; on this cf. 16:3, *ʾabhram ʾishah*, "Abram her husband"). Because of the appearance of the woman, he is no longer the only *ʾadham*, but he is still the only male and husband and bears the proper name *ʾadham*, i.e., he is *ʾish*, "man," with reference to the female fellow creature and wife. Only after the appearance of the *ʾishshah* did he function as an *ʾish*. Thus, both the creation of man in 2:7 and his differentiation into two sexes in 2:21f. are traced back to God. Consequently, God determines not only the position of man in creation in general and his relationship to God and to the other created beings (2:7; cf. 2:19f.), but also the equivalent position of man and woman and their close relationship to each other (2:21ff.), which is an I-Thou relationship. Therefore, this sexual differentiation also has a distinct social character about it (cf. 2:18, where *ʿezer*, "helper," is contrasted with *lebhadh*, "alone"; cf. also 2:20b), which is apparent in the use of → ידע *yādhaʿ*, "to know," to denote the sexual relationship. But this is not to say that the crucial point is to be found in the sexual relationship, because *ʾish* and *ʾishshah* extend beyond sex and emphasize that they are partners whose nature is the same, fellow creatures, Gk. *sýzygoi*. If the *ʾishshah* is *min haʾadham* and *meʾish*, "from the man," the *ʾish* is also *min haʾadhamah*, "from the ground" (2:7). The primacy of the *ʾish* over the *ʾishshah* is not the same as the primacy of man over the beasts which are subordinate to him, but is only a primacy of age (the man was created before the woman). However, this cannot mean that the man has a natural or ethical superiority over the *ʾishshah*, because God himself put the *ʾishshah* at his elbow, indeed by his side (2:21f., *tselaʿ*, "rib," which also means "side"). God brought the *ʾishshah* to the man as a father gives away his daughter to her husband (→ בוא *bôʾ* is also used elsewhere of bringing a girl to her husband; cf. Jgs. 12:9), which is apparently intended to indicate that God himself is responsible for establishing marriage. Before God and in the presence of the woman, the man acknowledges (this is the sense of → אמר *ʾāmar*, "to say," and → קרא *qārāʾ*, "to call," in Gen. 2:23) the equality of the partnership between *ʾish* and *ʾishshah* which God had established, and before God he makes a covenant with the woman (cf. 2:22b; 3:12, and the use of → נתן *nāthan*, "to give"), which, consequently, is a "covenant of God" (it is explicitly called *berith ʾelohim* in Prov. 2:17). In a type of "marriage formula," [15] he acknowledges the woman as "his wife," i.e., *ʾishto* (cf. Gen. 2:24; cf. also Ezk. 16:8b), which "indicates

---

14 Junker, *EB*, I, 28f.
15 Cf. on this de Vaux, 33ff.

Material com direitos autorais

b. In the second group, Yahweh (at first glance in contradiction to Dt. 4:12, 15ff., etc., and to the passages just mentioned) is described as an *'ish,* e.g., *'ish milchamoth,* "a man of war" (Isa. 42:13; cf. *keghibbor,* "a warrior," in Jer. 20:11). But this does not mean that God is thought to be identical with man; for God continues to be God, *yhvh 'ish milchamah yhvh shemo,* "Yahweh is a man of war; Yahweh is his name" (Ex. 15:3). Rather, this phrase is used to emphasize a particular attribute of God. According to the understanding which always appears elsewhere in Israel (cf. Ex. 14:14,25; Dt. 3:22; 32:30a; Josh. 23:10), when Yahweh fights against any enemy of his people as an *'ish milchamah,* "a man of war," the intention is to emphasize his omnipotence. He is also described as a war lord and a war god, who is recognized as the lord of world history through his dynamic intervention into history in behalf of his people. This metaphor seems to contradict Jer. 14:9 in particular: "why shouldst thou be like a man confused (*nidhham,* hapax legomenon)?" but the interrogative form used here indirectly expresses belief in the omnipotence of God.

c. In the third group, *'ish* and *'ishshah* with the meanings "husband" and "wife" respectively are used figuratively for the relationship between God and his people (or Zion). This is done either by using both substantives together (Hos. 2:4[2]), or by using only one of them with a synonymous word in place of the other (2:9[7]; Isa. 54:6f.; Jer. 3:3; Ezk. 23:2), or finally even by using synonyms of both of these words (Hos. 2:10[8]; Isa. 50:1; Jer. 2:2; 3:1,4,7f.; Ezk. 16:8ff.; 23:4ff.). Hosea especially uses this metaphor (2:4ff.[2ff.]); but it also appears in Deutero-Isaiah (Isa. 50:1; 54:5f.), Jeremiah (2:2; 3:1ff.), and Ezekiel (chaps. 16, 23). It is worthy of note that in Hosea alone *'ish* is used of God, even as a self-designation (Hos. 2:18[16]),[23] and the word *'ishshah* of the people of God (2:4b[2b]), while the other prophets use *'ishshah* in the figurative sense (Isa. 54:5f.; Jer. 3:3; cf. 3:1,20; Ezk. 23:2; cf. 16:32). This marital relationship (making of a covenant) is disrupted by adultery and desertion on the part of the *'ishshah,* so that the *'ish* (God) now no longer recognizes the *'ishshah* (the people) as his wife, and divorces her. When she returns to her longsuffering *'ish,* he declares that he wishes to restore the disrupted marital relationship by making a new covenant. These three stages, marriage–divorce–new covenant, appear in particular in Hosea (2:4ff.,9ff.,18ff.[2ff.,7ff.,16ff.]). In 2:4(2), as *'ish,* "husband," God addresses the children of the *'ishshah,* which are not, however, his own children, but are illegitimate (*bene zenunim,* 2:6[4]). Ezekiel alone, who elsewhere also gives a daring picture of the marital relationship between Yahweh and his people (Ezk. 23:2-4: Yahweh marries two sisters, and they are both prostitutes), mentions legitimate children, and even has Yahweh speak of *benehen 'asher yaledhu li,* "their sons whom they had borne to me" (Ezk. 23:37; cf. 23:4). In Hos. 2:4ff.(2ff.), the *'ish* (God) speaks of the *'ishshah* (people) in the 3rd person until he promises her that their relationship will be restored (2:21f.[19f.]). This indirect form of address, which expresses the husband's feeling of coolness toward his wife, is strengthened by his avoiding use of the

---

[23] On Isa. 54:4, see below.

Material com direitos autorais

word *'ishshah.*[24] Another address of the husband to the children of the wife alone is found in Isa. 50:1, but here the word *'ishshah* is not used; instead the husband speaks of a "bill of divorce" (Isa. 50:1; cf. Jer. 3:8). On the other hand, in Hos. 2:4(2), in the presence of the illegitimate children, the husband uses the divorce formula: *ki hi' lo' 'ishti ve'anokhi lo' 'ishah,* "for she is not my wife, and I am not her husband" (with the *lo'*, "not," which appears twice here, cf. the two names of children which have *lo'* as one component in 1:6,9). The word *'ishshah* is used only in the divorce formula; in the form *'ishti,* "my wife,"[25] it calls to mind the earlier period of fidelity and love (cf. 2:17b[15b], and also Jer. 2:2; 3:4, where *'abh,* "father," must be understood in a similar way). Thus, the time of the marital relationship is disrupted; according to Ezk. 16:8, as the husband, God himself had "sworn" (→ שׁבע *shābha'*) to the wife and had entered into a "covenant" (*berith)* with her. The "wife" alone is to blame for breaking this covenant because of her continuous adultery (cf. Hos. 2:7[5]) with different "lovers" (2:4ff.[2ff.]), for according to Ezk. 16:59 she "has despised the oath and broken the covenant" (cf. also Isa. 50:1; Jer. 3:20; cf. 3:1; Ezk. 16:32; perhaps also Isa. 54:6f.). Thus, the husband puts into operation the legal consequences of his wife's repeated adultery and dissolves the marriage when he pronounces the divorce formula. In Hos. 2:7ff.(5ff.), the husband speaks of the unchaste behavior of the wife which is reflected in her outward appearance (cf. 2:4b[2b]; cf. Jer. 3:3; Ezk. 23:40b,42b), and on the strength of this he announces measures which will be taken against her. However, he does not seem to have understood his decision as an irrevocable dissolution of the marriage, but uses these measures to try to get her to return (→ שׁוב *shûbh,* which assumes that the wife has run away) (Hos. 2:9[7]), thus demonstrating that he still loves her genuinely. He allows her return on the basis that she understands and admits that it was better with her when she was faithful to her first husband (2:9[7], where he has her say characteristically not *'ish,* "husband," but *'ishi,* "my husband"). This return is not unlawful (cf. Dt. 24:1-4), as Jer. 3:1 explicitly states (in spite of the unqualified divorce formula in Hos. 2:4[2], and in spite of the assumption of a second marriage in the use of *ri'shon,* "first," in 2:9b[7b]), because the woman speaks only of lovers (*me'ahebh* in 2:9a[7a]; cf. vv. 7,12,15[5,10,13]).[26] In order to bring about the return of the wife, he resorts to the use of enticements (→ פתה *pāthāh,* 2:16[14]), for he is convinced that this will cause her to follow him voluntarily (cf. 2:17bf.[15bf.]). However, the return of the wife is viewed as a future event, which is clear from the formula *vehayah bhayyom hahu',* "and in that day" (2:18a[16a]). But when she returns, as a verification of the genuineness of her decision she will use the address *'ishi,* "my husband" (in antithesis to the divorce formula in 2:4b[2b]), and no longer *ba'ali,* "my Baal (lord, master)" (2:18b[16b]). Here, moreover, a clear distinction is made between *'ish* and the ambiguous word *ba'al,* which can mean the Canaanite god Baal (and thus symbolize idolatry) or marital lord. One cannot fail to see that this

---

[24] See below.
[25] See above, III.1.d.
[26] But cf. H. W. Wolff, *Hosea,* 36.

Material com direitos autorais

passage proclaims a new social relationship between man and woman in which the man is no longer the woman's *baʿal,* "marital lord," but the man with whom God made her an equal, as before the Fall. This distinction seems to mean even more, however, because on the one hand *ʾish* repeatedly relates *baʿal* to the lovers (2:10,15[8,13]), while on the other hand *baʿal* also denotes the idols in 2:10(8). Furthermore, the *ʾish,* "husband," declares in 2:19(17) that he will intervene dynamically, and as a result the wife will no longer mention the *beʿalim* or even think of them. One is justified in assuming that in 2:18b(16b), *ʾishi* is used as a designation for the husband (God), and *baʿali* for his rivals, the "lovers," i.e., the idols. Therefore, the wife of the *ʾish* is strongly admonished (*velo' thiqre'i,* v. 18[16]) not only to sever all relationships with the *baʿal,* but also to avoid completely anything that might imperil her marital fidelity. Merely the mention of the ambiguous *baʿali* would remind the wife of her infidelity; in the ambiguity it can be seen that Baalistic syncretism is in the background of this picture.

In light of this, at first glance Isa. 54:5 seems strange. Here Yahweh says to Jerusalem, which is designated as his wife: *ki bhoʿalayikh ʿosayikh yhvh tsebhaʾoth shemo,* "for your Maker is your Husband, Yahweh of hosts is his name." In order to understand this metaphor, it is necessary to take into consideration what is said in Hos. 2:20ff.(18ff.) concerning the future restoration of the relationship between God and his people. In this passage the *ʾish* (God) is repeated, and now he addresses the *ʾishshah* (people) in the 2nd person. Three times he promises her, "I will betroth you" (*ʾaras,* Hos. 2:21f.[19f.]); cf. the thrice repeated expression, "I will establish my covenant with you (i.e., Jerusalem)" in Ezk. 16:60,62. On the other hand, the husband promises to adopt the illegitimate children of the wife (Hos. 2:24f.[22f.]). Thus, the marital relationship between God and his people passes over into an adoption relationship.

d. The last two groups of passages show that God is represented in the OT not only anthropomorphically, but also andromorphically, i.e., as a male. The same thing is also true of his angel.[27] Furthermore, his servants are predominantly men; it is true that in the Yahweh religion there are some prophetesses, but there are no priestesses. But this andromorphic idea of God should not be understood to apply merely to sex, because there are no proofs for such an application. However, this idea of God is made clear by the general view of man in the OT, i.e., his physical and psychic characteristics which distinguish him from the woman and her characteristics.[28] In this regard, the general OT idea of God is different from that of other ancient Near Eastern cultures. Moreover, the deeper theological meaning of this OT idea and its religio-historical interpretation continue on as a fundamental theological belief.

3. *As a Medium of Revelation. ʾish* also appears in a group of passages which deal with the messenger of God or the medium of revelation.

---

[27] See below, II.3.a.
[28] Cf. II.2.c.

Copyrighted material

(2 K. 4:7-13,16), Shemaiah (1 K. 12:22; 2 Ch. 11:2), and Igdaliah (Jer. 35:4). In several passages this term refers to men who remain anonymous (1 S. 2:27; 1 K. 13:1-31; 2 K. 23:16f.; 1 K. 20:28; 2 Ch. 25:7,9). All these persons are charismatics who are closely connected with God, but whose offices and duties are different. Sometimes the Bible reports nothing about such a "man of God" other than this name (Jer. 35:4). Also, every attempt to determine with certainty the geographical home of this idea is doomed to failure (the stories of Elijah and Elisha may favor the northern kingdom; but cf. 1 K. 12:22; 13:1ff., esp. v. 18; 2 K. 23:16f.; Jer. 35:4). In addition, there are other questions for which there are no conclusive answers. Thus, e.g., no satisfactory explanation has yet been given as to why Moses and David, as well as Shemaiah or even Igdaliah, are characterized as "men of God." And further: Is it accidental that this expression not only does not occur in the prophetic books, but also is not used to refer to the literary prophets or to other well-known charismatics (only the LXX of 1 K. 12:15 speaks of Ahijah as a "man of God," cf. 14:3), although the book of Jeremiah is familiar with this idea (35:4)? Why is it that the OT never uses the expression *'ish yhvh,* "man of Yahweh," as e.g., it uses *mal'akh yhvh,* "angel of Yahweh," in addition to *mal'akh 'elohim,* "angel of God?" Although Elijah fought zealously for the success of the Yahweh faith, he is designated only as *'ish ha'elohim.* The comparative material from ancient Near Eastern literature which is available to us at the present time is neither adequate nor certain,[29] and thus is unable to help us solve these problems. Also, there is no basis for connecting *'ish ha'elohim* with demons.[30]

Hölscher compares the expression *'ish 'elohim* with Arab. *ḏū 'ilāhin,* "possessor of an *'ilah,* i.e., of a divine being or demon," who can also be a *kāhin,* "soothsayer." Then *'elohim* here would not mean Yahweh, but "the demon," and the expression would be comparable with *ba'alath 'obh,* "a medium" (1 S. 28:7), and *'ish haruach,* "man of the spirit" (Hos. 9:7), and originally would have designated one possessed by God. Haldar refers to Sum. *lu-dingir-ra,* Akk. *amēl ili,* "man of God," and interprets this expression as "man who is consecrated to the (cultic) service of a God."[31] Lindblom[32] understands *'ish 'elohim* as a man who has a close relationship to God and participates in divine characteristics and powers and therefore is peculiarly well suited to be a messenger of God (→ מלאך *mal'ākh*) (cf. Hag. 1:13; Mal. 2:7).[33]

In view of all these facts, it is necessary to proceed very cautiously in interpreting this concept, and to begin only with data that are certain. It is significant that in the OT there is no *'esheth ha'elohim,* "woman of God," corresponding to *'ish ha'elohim,* although there is an *'ishshah nebhi'ah,* "a woman, a prophetess" (Jgs. 4:4), and also elsewhere there is a *nebhi'ah,* "prophetess,"

---

29 Cf. Dhorme, *RB,* 40 (1931), 36.

30 So Hölscher, 127, n., against whom Junker, *Prophet,* 77f., has already given a reply.

→ אלהים *'elōhîm.*

31 Haldar, 29f., 126f.

32 Lindblom, 60f.

33 Haldar, 128.

Copyrighted material

corresponding to *nabhi'*. Further, it is to be observed that the concept "man of God" is used in many passages as a particularly reverential designation (1 K. 17:24; 2 K. 4:9); thus, it is understandable that in a later period this expression was applied to Moses and David. So also, Manoah and his wife call the angel (whose identity was not yet known to them, but in whose countenance they sensed something supernatural) a man of God (Jgs. 13:6,8). It is characteristic that the angel comes with a specific message from God. Also, at other times the expression *'ish ha'elohim* is prevalent in the popular vernacular (1 S. 9:6ff.; 1 K. 17:18,24; 2 K. 1:9,11,13; 4:9,16,25,40; 23:17). But also the narrator (1 S. 2:27; 1 K. 12:22; 13:1,4ff.; 20:28; 2 K. 4:21; 5:8,14; 23:16) or a prophet (1 K. 13:14,26) uses it. Frequently, the "man of God" comes with a prophetic word to an individual (1 S. 2:27ff.; 1 K. 17:14; 2 K. 4:3; etc.), to the king as well as to the people (1 K. 12:22ff.; 13:1ff.; 17:1f.; 20:28; 2 K. 1:16). He is the one commissioned by God (as is explicitly stated in 1 K. 12:22ff.; 17:2ff.,8f.; 2 K. 1:15; cf. also 1 S. 2:27; 1 K. 13:1f.; 20:28; 2 K. 3:17f.), who, like an angel (Jgs. 13:3ff.), appears and vanishes suddenly (1 S. 2:27; 1 K. 20:28), but also can remain (1 S. 9:6ff.; 1 K. 12:22; 13:1ff.; 17:17ff.; 2 K. 4:9ff.). Quite often the expression "man of God" appears together with *nabhi'*, "prophet" (cf. 1 S. 9:6ff. with v. 9, where *ro'eh*, "seer," and *nabhi'* appear; 1 K. 17:18,24 with 19:16, where *nabhi'* appears). "Man of God" is even equated with "prophet" (1 K. 13:18; but cf. 1 K. 20:28, where a "man of God" appears alongside a *nabhi'* in 20:13,22, and alongside the *nebhi'im*, "prophets," in 20:35). 1 K. 19:16f.,19ff. speaks of the call of a man who serves for a long time as a disciple of a "man of God," only later to become a "man of God" himself (1 K. 19:20f.; 2 K. 2:2ff.). Yet, quite often "men of God" are "prophets" (they are equated in 1 K. 19:16; 18:22). In addition, "man of God" appears in connection with *ruach*, "spirit" (2 K. 2:9f.), and is acknowledged as a "holy man" (→ קדוש *qādhôsh*, 2 K. 4:9). Further, the OT indicates that "men of God" strongly refused to accept any gift for healing people, etc. (1 K. 13:7ff.; 2 K. 5:15ff.; cf. Jgs. 13:7ff.; contra 1 S. 9:7f.,10). Sometimes it seems to be widely known that a certain man is an *'ish ha'elohim* (a self-designation in 2 K. 1:10,12; cf. 1 K. 13:14); this helps us understand why such a man had the courage to appear before the king. The "man of God" often appears as a miracle-worker, either by the express commission of God (1 K. 17:14ff.; 2 K. 2:21f.; 4:43; cf. 1 K. 13:4) or apparently on his own authority (2 K. 2:8,14; 4:16f.). In the latter case, he performs his miracles through the power of God (1 K. 13:6; 17:20ff.; 2 K. 4:33ff.), or simply by prophesying (2 K. 1:10,12; 2:10; 4:4ff.; 5:10ff.). The curse of a "man of God" causes incurable illness (5:27) and even death (2:24f.).

N. P. Bratsiotis

not to eat "the bread of men" (*lechem ʾanashim,* Ezk. 24:17,22). Hosea speaks of *lechem ʾonim,* "the bread of grief (or mourning)," which defiles those who eat of it (Hos. 9:4). Eating gives life and strengthens the "soul." When eating involves some form of fellowship–with one's family, relatives, or covenant partners–it produces divine power which strengthens the unity. Meals establish harmony, which is the prerequisite for all communal life. It was a serious crime to disrupt such a fellowship (Ps. 41:10[9]). It was unthinkable for someone to eat with his enemies. [23]

2. *Food Laws.* Eating was strictly regulated by numerous food laws in the OT. The broad statement in Gen. 9:3 is restricted by the distinction it makes between clean and unclean (→ טמא *ṭāmēʾ*) animals (Lev. 11:1ff.; Dt. 14:3ff.). Eating the flesh of an animal that died of itself made one unclean (Lev. 11:40), and it was an abomination to eat animals that had been torn apart by beasts (Ex. 22:30[31]; Ezk. 4:14). No flesh that "had its blood (→ דם *dām*) in it" was to be eaten (Gen. 9:4; Ex. 12:7; Lev. 3:17; 7:23,26; 17:14; Dt. 12:16,23f.); in general, blood was forbidden food (Lev. 7:26f.; 17:10ff.; 1 S. 14:32ff.; Ezk. 33:25).

There were special regulations for Nazirites, soldiers, Levites, and priests, because their professions placed them in holy isolation. The Nazirite had to abstain from wine; in fact, he could not eat grapes at all (Nu. 6:3f.). It goes without saying that he could eat no unclean food (Jgs. 13:4). The expectant mother of a Nazirite also observed the Nazirite regulations (13:7,14). According to Uriah's words to David in 2 S. 11:11, soldiers in the levies gave up all claim to the pleasures of civilian life ("to eat and to drink, and to lie with my wife"); however, David and his men could eat the bread of the Presence when they were in the situation of the holy war (1 S. 21:1-6). [24] The Levitical priests, who had received no inheritance of their own, were to "eat the offerings by fire to Yahweh, and their rightful dues (*nachalah*)" (Dt. 18:1; cf. Gen. 47:22, which speaks of the priests of Egypt who "eat their *choq*," i.e., live on the income allotted to them); thus, they were to live on their portion of the sacrifices and other dues. Dt. 14:27ff. speaks of tithes of produce for priests, sojourners, widows, and orphans. Moreover, the priests were to eat the cereal-offering that remained of the offering by fire to Yahweh (Lev. 10:12f.), the breast that is waved and the thigh that is heaved (10:14). Likewise, the sin-offering was eaten by the priests, but only at holy places (10:17f.; Hos. 4:8). The Levites ate the festival sacrifice (*moʿedh,* 2 Ch. 30:22). The priest and his house ate of the holy votive offerings (*qodhashim*), but not when they were in an unclean state (Lev. 22:1ff.). However, neither a foreigner (an outsider) nor a woman married to a foreigner was allowed to eat the holy things (Ex. 29:33; Lev. 22:10,12).

Ottosson

---

[23] *Ibid.,* I-II, 305f.

[24] Cf. *ibid.,* III-IV, 10ff.; de Vaux, 258ff.

name.[3] That El was the name of a particular deity should have been clear from the beginning from Sakkunyaton's "Phoenician theology" preserved in fragments in Eusebius' *Praeparatio evangelica.*[4]

Moving to East Semitic we find again very ancient evidence that 'Il was the proper name of a deity. 'Il appears often in Old Akkadian in the earliest sources[5] without the case ending (exclusive of the predicate state), unambiguously the divine name and not an appellative. The forms *Ilu* and *Ilum* are ambiguous as are forms written logographically with DINGIR, but many are no doubt the divine name. For example, the pattern *DN-i₃-lum* does not occur, but kinship names (Abu-ilum, Aḫu-ilum, etc.) and like patterns (Ilum-bānī, "God/El is my creator," Ilum-qurād, "God/El is a warrior") are frequent and give the same picture of the god as patron, creator, "god of the father,"[6] and warrior that we find in unambiguous names. One finds also names like I-lī-DINGIR-lum/ Ilī-ilum, "my god is Il(um)." I. J. Gelb has gone so far as to say, "we may note the very common use of the element *Il* in Akkadian theophorous names, which seems to indicate that the god *Il* (later Semitic *El*) was the chief divinity of the Mesopotamian Semites in the Pre-Sargonic Period."[7]

In the Amorite onomasticon of the 18th century B.C. the god 'Il plays a large role.[8] Occasionally the divine name is spelled *ila,* which many scholars have normalized *'ilāh.*[9] It is perhaps best to take the *-a* of *ila* as a morpheme denoting the predicate state both in Amorite and Old Akkadian.[10]

Among the more interesting Amorite names are those compounded with *sumu,* "the name," *sumuhu,* "his name," *sumuna,* "our name," plus a divine name or epithet. The element *sum-* refers to the name of the god of the family or clan (that is, the personal god) on whom he can call or by whom he swears. Frequently we find this element compounded with *Il* or *Ila*: *su-mu-la-AN/ sumu(hu)-la-'il,* "his personal god is indeed 'Il," *sa-mu-ú-i-la/Samuhu-Ila, su-mu-AN/sumu-il,* etc. The same name formation is found in Heb. *shemu'el,* "Samuel" (⟨*šimuhu-'El*>*šimû'El*), and in Old South Arab. *śm'l.* Such a hypostatization of the name stands in the background of the Deuteronomistic name theology.[11]

---

3 Eissfeldt, *El im Ugaritischen Pantheon.*

4 The best critical text is that of K. Mras, *Eusebius Werke,* VIII/1 (1954), i.10.1-44. Cf. Clemen; Eissfeldt, *Ras Schamra und Sanchunjaton; idem, Sanchunjaton von Berut.* The most thoroughgoing recent study of Sakkunyaton is the unpublished Harvard dissertation of Lynn R. Clapham, *Sanchuniathon: The First Two Cycles* (1969).

5 The most recent study is J. J. M. Roberts, *The Early Akkadian Pantheon: A Study of the Semitic Deities Attested in Mesopotamia before Ur III* (diss., Harvard, 1969; now published). Cf. also I. J. Gelb, *Glossary of Old Akkadian* (Chicago, 1957), 26-36, esp. 28; *idem, Old Akk. Writing,* 139-142, 145, 148.

6 Cross, "Yahweh and the God of the Patriarchs."

7 *Old Akk. Writing,* 6.

8 Huffmon, *APNM,* 162f.

9 *APNM,* 165.

10 Cf. Gelb, *Old Akkadian Writing,* 146f., and *La lingua degli Amoriti.* AANLR, 13 (1958), 55f., 154.

11 Cf. S. D. McBride, *The Deuteronomic Name Theology* (diss., Harvard, 1969), 136-141.

After some broken text, the drama opens with El at his abode near the sea.

[31] *El takes two ladlesful,*
Two ladlesful filling a flagon.
[32] *Behold one: she bends low*
Behold the other: she rises up
Behold one cries Sire! Sire!
[33] *Behold the other cries Mother! Mother!*
El's power is great like Sea's
[34] *El's power is like that of Flood*
Long is El's member like Sea's
[35] *El's member like that of Flood*
El takes two ladlesful,
[36] *Two ladlesful filling a flagon,*
He takes (it), he drinks in his house.
[37] *El stretches his bowstave*
He drew his mighty shaft
He lifts (it), [38] *he shoots skyward.*
He shoots a bird in the sky,
He plucks (it), he sets [39] *on coals.*
El indeed seduced his wives
[40] *Lo the two women cried:*
O husband! husband! stretched your bowstave,
Drawn is your mighty shaft.
[41] *Behold the bird is roasted*
Broiled on the coals.
[42] *The women are (now) the wives of El*
The wives of El for ever.

After repetitions with subtle variations we read:

[49] *He reclines, he kisses their lips,*
[50] *Lo their lips are sweet,*
Sweet as grapes.
[51] *As they kiss they conceive*
As they embrace, they are made pregnant
[52] *The two travail and give birth*
To the gods Dawn and Dusk.

El in this text lives up to his reputation found in Sakkunyaton's lore that he was a vigorous and prodigiously lusty old man as is fitting for the primordial procreator and patriarch.

We have translated in the historical present since the movement back and forth in time is more easily expressed in this fashion. Line 32: The two wives, no doubt mentioned in the break, bob up and down in embarrassment and excitement. Lines 33ff.: We have expressed the *double entendre* by translating the identical cola differently. For the idiom "long of hand," meaning "great in power," compare Heb. *qitsre yadh,* "short of hand" (2 K. 19:26), or *hayadh*

Copyrighted material

4. *El the Divine Patriarch: Summary.* One cannot describe El as a sky-god like Anu, a storm-god like Enlil or Zeus, a chthonic-god like Nergal, or a grain-god like Dagon. The one image of El that seems to tie all his myths together is that of the patriarch. He is the primordial father of gods and men, sometimes stern, often compassionate, always wise in judgment.

While he has taken on royal prerogatives and epithets, he stands closer to the patriarchal judge ruling over the council of the gods. He is at once father of the family of gods and ruler, functions brought together in the human sphere only in those societies which are organized in tribal leagues or in kingdoms where kinship survives as an organizing power in the society. He is a tent dweller in most of his myths. His tent on the mount of assembly in the far north is the place of cosmic decisions. There are myths of monumental carousals where he appears to live in a palace (*hekhal*) and live like a king. Such uneven layers of tradition in oral poetry should not be surprising.

El is creator, the ancient one, whose extraordinary procreative powers have populated heaven and earth, and there is little evidence that his vigor flagged. To be sure, he rests now from the ancient wars in which he won his patriarchal authority; feats of arms "now" are fought by the younger gods, Baʿal in particular, and he shares El's rule. His old wife, the mother of the gods, is occupied with intrigues in the family. El appears affectionate toward her, but the *hieros gamos* texts we have reveal that he often turns to younger wives. His three major consorts are his sisters, ʿAnat, Asherah (the chief wife), and Astarte. Baʿal also takes ʿAnat as consort, and El shows particular favor to Astarte, the divine courtesan.

In Akkadian and Amorite religion, as also in Canaanite, he frequently plays the role of "god of the father," the "social" deity who governs the tribe or league, leading it in its migrations, directing its wars, establishing its justice, often bound to league or king with kinship or covenant bonds.

His characteristic mode of manifestation appears to be the vision or audition, often in dreams in contrast to the theophany of the storm-god, whose voice is the thunder and who goes out to battle riding the clouds, shaking the mountains with the blasts of his nostrils and his fiery bolts.

III. El in the OT.

1. *El As a Divine Proper Name.* (a) El is rarely if ever used in the Bible as the proper name of a non-Israelite, Canaanite deity in the full consciousness of a distinction between El and Yahweh, god of Israel. In Ezk. 28:2, the prophet's famous oracle on Tyre, he describes Canaanite El in excessively mythological terms, suggesting his awareness that he is singing of the Canaanite deity: "Because your heart was proud you (Tyre) said, I am El (*'el 'ani*) / in the seat of Elohim I am enthroned in the midst of the seas." The abode of El is here precisely described in Canaanite language. Yet there are problems. Ezekiel uses *'elohim* in parallel to *'el* here, and later in vv. 14 and 16 speaks of El's mountain as *har 'elohim,* "the mountain of God"; and in v. 2 he uses *'el* in its fairly frequent generic sense. I am inclined to believe that the prophet was aware of the back-

Материјал заштићен ауторским правима

the name was from *ṯdw/y,* "breast," "mountain."[55] From Ugaritic have come new data confirming the existence of *ṯdy* in Canaanite with the meaning "mountains," and distinguishing it from *šd,* "field."[56] Thus, the personal name *šdyn* is related to ^{m}A.ŠÀ-ia-nu with the ideogram for "field," while *ṯdy ṯdyn* belongs with ^{m}ša-du-ia and ^{m}KUR^{du}-ia and contains the element "mountain."[57] Shaddai is thus the "one of the Mountain." We cannot yet determine whether El Shaddai was (1) Baʿal-Haddu of Mt. Ṣaphon, (2) an epithet of El like the other discussed above, or (3) an old Amorite god of the mountains who was identified early by the Fathers with Canaanite El. The importance of El's mountain is such that we are inclined to accept (2) or (3), or a combination in which Amorite El is identified with Canaanite El.

In summary we have found that the epithets *ʾEl ʿOlam, ʾEl qoneh ʾarts,* and *ʾEl ʾelohe yisraʾel* are epithets of El taken over from patriarchal tradition: *ʾEl ʿelyon* probably is to be added, and there is a possibility, at least, that *ʾEl shaddai* is an El epithet. To these we should add *ʾEl berith* and *Baʿal berith,* or what was probably the unshortened epithet, *ʾEl baʿal berith.*

(c) The term *ʾel* is also used in the formation of epithets of Yahweh in the early cultus of Israel. Some of these persist in usage until late times. Late in Israel's history, for example in the sectarian literature of Qumran, there is a revival of the formation of epithets after the ancient pattern of El plus a substantive, adjective or verbal adjective.

In the archaic liturgical material preserved by the epic source in Ex. 34:6, the God of Israel recites his names *yhvh yhvh ʾel rachum vechannun,* etc. Are we to read "El the compassionate and merciful" or "the merciful and compassionate god"? It must be said that the epithets here are reminiscent of El's, expressing the same benign attributes, and I am inclined to think that at least this portion of the long liturgical name is pre-Yahwistic. In any case, this archaic epithet is found in later tradition in slightly variant forms: Dt. 4:31; Jonah 4:2; Ps. 86:15 (probably *ʾel nose'*, "a forgiving God," in Ps. 99:8 is a reminiscence of the long formula with *nś' ʿwn*). A formula somewhat similar is *ʾel qanna'*, "a jealous God," found in Yahwistic tradition (Ex. 34:14), Elohistic tradition (20:5; Josh. 24:19) as well as later tradition (Dt. 4:24; 5:9; 6:15; Nah. 1:2). There appear to be no parallels in Canaanite polytheism to the exclusive loyalty demanded by Yahweh in his covenant forms. We judge this epithet to have arisen in the very early cultus of Israel, patterned upon living liturgical epithets of the day.

In Ps. 29:3 is the epithet *ʾel kabhodh* (the article is secondary here). Probably it meant originally not "the god of glory," or "El the Glorious," but "god of the thunder cloud," the *ʿanan kabhedh* (cf. Ex. 19:16), an epithet of Baʿal originally. Much of the language of the storm theophany used of Yahweh is taken from

---

55 Albright; Cross, "Yahweh and the God of the Patriarchs," 244-250.
56 So A. F. Rainey.
57 Cf. Gröndahl, *PNU,* 191f., 417.

Copyrighted material

frequent. In the Oracles of Balaam *'el* as the name of the God of Israel appears six times, once parallel to Yahweh (Nu. 23:8), once parallel to *'elyon* (24:16), once parallel to *shaddai* (24:4), once in contrast to *'adham,* "man" (23:19; the other two places where *'el* occurs are 23:22 and 24:8). It is used also in 2 S. 23:5 (the "Last Words of David"), and Ps. 89:8(7) in a similar way.

In the book of Job, El is used some 50 times as the proper name of the God of Israel, parallel to Shaddai 12 times. The pattern of use of divine names in Job actually warrants a separate study. Yahweh is never used in the dialogues (Job 12:9 would appear to be an exception; however, the textual evidence is divided between *'eloah* and *yhvh*). On the other hand Yahweh is regular in the Prologue and Epilogue, and in the rubrics of the Yahweh speeches; i.e., Yahweh only appears in the prose parts of the book. One must argue, I believe, that the poet of the dialogues belongs either to a different tradition, or is engaged in a heroic attempt to archaize, or both (Job is unusual also in using the rare *'eloah* some 40 times versus some 16 occurrences in all other books).

The closest parallels to Job's use of El, other than the usage in the Balaam Oracles, are found in a few passages of the Elohist (Gen. 35:1,3; 46:3; Nu. 12:13) and in the so-called Elohistic Psalter. Some 15 times in Pss. 43–83, El is used as the proper name of God, more often in its 42 psalms than in all the remaining 108 psalms belonging to other collections.

These data suggest strongly the northern or non-Judean Israelite origin of the book of Job.

In describing the use of El as the proper name of deity in the Psalter, we must note also that El tends to be used in early poetry, especially the early psalms of the Elohistic Psalter (e.g., Ps. 78 has six instances of the use of El as a proper name of Yahweh), and in quite late psalms throughout the Psalter. This late usage of El presumably signalizes the revival of the use of El which we find highly developed in the Qumran and contemporary Jewish literature.

We have not dealt with the onomasticon of Israel in this study.[59] One or two generalizations should be made. The use of El both as a proper name of the god of Israel and as an appellative in personal names is most frequent in the earliest period of Israel's existence, and in the postexilic period. Thus we find the curve of distribution of El-names paralleling the general usage of the divine names in the literature of Israel. In the intervening period of the first temple, "Yahweh" displaced El as a proper name, *'elohim* replaced *'el* as the generic appellative. Presumably the increasing sense of the sacredness of Yahweh and the fully conscious universalism of the postexilic age converged to stimulate the revival of El as the name of Israel's god and as a proper element in proper names.

In the late literature of Israel only Second Isaiah other than Job makes extensive use of El as a proper name of the god of Israel (see, e.g., Isa. 40:18; 43:10,12; 45:14). We judge the phenomenon to be explained by his reutilization of old liturgical forms[60] and his general impulse to archaize much in the same way as does the author of the dialogues of Job.

---

[59] See Noth, *IPN,* 82-101.

[60] Cross, *JThC,* 6 (1969), 161-65.

Copyrighted material

idiom: *'en/yesh le'el yadhi* and variants, meaning "It is/is not within my power." No suitable explanation has ever been made of the use of *'el* in this idiom even though the meaning of the phrase is clear enough from context.

The idiom is to be explained, I believe, by redivision of the words: *'en lo' leyadhi,* "my hand has no power." The root *l'y* is extremely common in Canaanite as well as other Semitic languages in the meaning "be powerful"; it has indeed been identified in a number of biblical passages, [64] and clearly is to be read here.

Cross

---

[64] Cf. Dahood, *Psalms,* I. *AB,* XVI (1965), 46.

אָלָה *'ālāh;* אָלָה *'ālāh;* תַּאֲלָה *ta'ªlāh*

Contents: I. 1. Etymology, Meaning; 2. Related Ideas in the Ancient Near East. II. Use in Legal Situations: 1. Protection of Property; 2. Proof of Guilt; 3. Execution of Authoritative Commands; 4. Ratification of Treaties. III. Use in the Religious Sphere, Covenant Ratification. IV. Metonymic Use. V. Theological Evaluation. VI. Qumran, LXX.

I. 1. *Etymology, Meaning.* Outside the OT, the root *'lh* is authenticated in Arab. *'lw* IV and V, "to swear, curse," *'alwe,* "oath, curse," and the Phoenician stative construct *'lt,* only in *KAI,* 27.9,13-15 with the meaning "curse" and "promise" (*krt 'lt 'lm*). In the OT, the verb occurs in the qal (Jgs. 17:2; Hos. 4:2; 10:4) and in the hiphil (1 S. 14:24: *vayyo'el;* 1 K. 8:31 = 2 Ch. 6:22: *leha'alotho*), and the noun *'alah* appears 36 times. The noun *ta'alah* in Lam. 3:65 is probably also to be derived from this root. In translating the different forms, one should always begin with the meaning, "to pronounce a conditional curse."

'ālāh. S. H. Blank, "The Curse, Blasphemy, the Spell and the Oath," *HUCA,* 23 (1950/51), 73-95; H. C. Brichto, *The Problem of "Curse" in the Hebrew Bible. JBL Monograph Series,* 13 (Philadelphia, 1963), 22-76; T. Canaan, "The Curse in Palestinian Folklore," *JPOS,* 15 (1935), 235-279; *idem,* "Flüche unter den Arabern Jordaniens," *Studii Bibl. Franciscani,* L.A. 13 (1962/63), 110-135; J. Hempel, "Die israelitischen Anschauungen von Segen und Fluch im Lichte altorientalischer Parallelen," *ZDMG,* 79 (1925), 20-110; F. Horst, "Der Diebstahl im AT," *Festschrift P. Kahle* (1935), 19-28; *idem,* "Der Eid im AT," *EvTh,* 17 (1957), 366-384; both of these articles now appear in *Gottes Recht = ThB,* 12 (1961), 167-175, 292-314; S. Mowinckel, *Segen und Fluch in Israels Kult und Psalmendichtung. Psalmenstudien,* V (1923), 61-135; J. Pedersen, *Der Eid bei den Semiten* (1914), 64-118; J. Scharbert, "'Fluchen' und 'Segnen' im AT," *Bibl,* 39 (1958), 1-26, esp. 2-5; further literature may be found under → אָרַר *'ārar.*

Copyrighted material

is probably to be ascribed, knows that the curse does not necessarily come upon the guilty. One must ask God to put the curse into operation and to prove whether the person is guilty. It is obviously realized from the very first that a curse pronounced on an accused person may not be effective in every case and immediately, and thus his guilt may not be satisfactorily proved. Therefore, such a curse could also be abused in making unjustified accusations. Once the accusation was made and the ordeal curse pronounced, the matter was put in suspense because the curse might begin to take effect on the accused only after a long time, in the form of illness or some other misfortune. In any case, the person accused carried a public blemish if his innocence was not evident. Therefore, there is much in favor of Brichto's conjecture that the prohibition in Ex. 20:7 and the Liturgy of Entrance into the Temple in Ps. 24:4 represent attempts to put an end to this kind of abuse of an *'alah* in which one called on the name of Yahweh.[11] Hosea denounces this sort of abuse (4:2), and the godly man expects such an *'alah* to fall upon the unrighteous accuser when Yahweh calls him into account (Ps. 10:7; 59:13[12]).

It was only because *'alah* was no longer understood as real magic that it could be connected with the covenant idea. Indeed, the curse with which Yahweh himself ratified his covenant with Israel constantly threatened the covenant-breaking people; but at the same time, the written curse formulas which were attached to the covenant law did not operate on the principle of magic, but only because Yahweh himself put the curse into effect from time to time. If Yahweh is in control of the curse, he is also free to stop it or to revoke it. But since the *'alah* is a very effective instrument in God's acts of punishment, the godly can also see a meaning behind a dreadful event that comes upon the people in their history, and can recognize God's power in it.

VI. Qumran, LXX. In connection with accepting a new member into the Qumran community, the Qumran literature declares a blessing to the faithful, but curses to those who become unfaithful to the rule of the community, which is called a covenant (*berith*). In 1QS 2:16 and 5:12, these curses are called "curses of the covenant" (*'aloth* [*hab*]*berith*). But in the Damascus Document, the "curses of the covenant" are obviously the curses that ratify the Mosaic Law (CD 1:17; 15:2f.). In 9:12, a "sworn curse" (oath of malediction) is required to prove whether the accused has committed a theft, as in Lev. 5:1. The LXX renders *'alah* in Gen. 24:41 (only the second occurrence, evidently for stylistic variation) and Lev. 5:1 by *horkismós,* in Prov. 29:24 by *hórkos,* and in Ezk. 17:18f. by *horkōmosía,* all of which mean "oath," corresponding completely to the meaning of the MT. Several times there is no word in the LXX corresponding to *'alah* in the MT (Jer. 23:10; 29:18; Ezk. 16:59; 2 Ch. 34:24). In all other passages, the noun is rendered by *ará* and *katára,* "curse," and the verb by *arásthai,* "to curse." No striking variation in meaning is to be found in the LXX.

Scharbert

---

11 Brichto, 59-67, 70f.

7. *Irregular Use.* Finally, we may mention certain passages in which *'elohim* has a somewhat irregular meaning. In 1 S. 28:13, the medium at Endor calls the spirit of Samuel which had come up an *'elohim,* i.e., a nonhuman or "supernatural" being. The same idea appears in Isa. 8:19: "Should not a people consult their *'elohim,* the dead on behalf of the living?" In Ps. 8:6(5) ("Thou hast made him [man] little less than *'elohim*"), the most natural meaning of *'elohim* is "divine being" (cf. the LXX *par' angélous,* "than angels"); the crucial thing here is the similarity with the divine in general. Ps. 45:7(6), where the king apparently is addressed as *'elohim,* is an entirely different matter. If one is unwilling to conclude from this that the king, at least in some circles, was considered to be "divine" (and thus somehow elevated into the superhuman sphere), then one must either connect *'elohim* with *kis'akha* ("thy divine throne"), which is grammatically strained, or consider *'elohim* as an Elohistic substitution for *yhvh* and explain it as a faulty writing of *yihyeh: kis'akha yihyeh 'olam va'edh,* "thy throne will endure (exist) for ever and ever." The first explanation seems to be the simplest.

V. Assertions of Incomparability. But the claims about a being who may justifiably be called "God" can also be increased. In fact, one of the fundamental questions of the Hebrew religion is, Who is really God?

An ancient formula, which, indeed, has parallels in the Akkadian (and to some extent Egyptian) hymnic literature, appears in Ex. 15:11: "Who is like thee among the gods (*mi khamokhah ba'elim*)? Who is like thee, majestic (*ne'dar*) in holiness, terrible in glorious deeds, doing wonders (*pele'*)?" Such questions have a logical meaning in a polytheistic context like in the Babylonian-Assyrian religion, where even several gods are represented as incomparable. In Israel, Yahweh can be compared with the gods of other nations (and this is perhaps the case in Ex. 15); but as time passed by, the conviction became stronger that in reality Yahweh is the only one who rightly wears the attributes "glorious," "holy," "terrible," etc., i.e., who is really God.

A similar statement appears in Ps. 89:7(6): "Who in the skies can be compared (*'arakh*) to Yahweh? Who among the *bene 'elim* (sons of God) is like Yahweh?" The comparison here clearly refers to the other divine or heavenly beings, the Israelite vestige of the Canaanite assembly of the gods. Cf. also Ps. 113:5f.: "Who is like Yahweh our God . . . in heaven and on earth?"

These passages indicate that the origin of the assertion of Yahweh's incomparability is to be sought in the hymnic literature. The idea is then further elaborated in Deuteronomy and in the Deuteronomistic history, as is clear from the following quotations: Dt. 3:24: "What God is there in heaven or on earth who can do such works and mighty acts as thine?"; 4:7: "What great nation is there that has a god so near to it as Yahweh our God is to us?" 4:34f.: "Has any god ever attempted to go and take a nation for himself . . . ? Yahweh is God; there is no other besides him" (*yhvh hu' ha'elohim 'en 'odh milebhaddo*); 4:39: "Yahweh is God in heaven above and on the earth beneath; there is no other." The main emphasis here is on God's working in history, the choice of Israel and their deliverance from Egypt; but one observes the tendency to deny

Материал, защищенный авторским правом

that there is really any God other than Yahweh. But in their context, these passages have in mind the only God of Israel, whose commandments Israel must keep.

2 S. 7:22 dispenses with the use of comparison in asserting the uniqueness of Yahweh: "There is none like thee, and there is no God besides thee" (*'en kamokha ve'en 'elohim zulathekha*). That which follows is interesting because it shows that the main point is neither the superiority of Yahweh nor that of Israel, but the unique relationship between Yahweh and Israel. A similar statement appears in Solomon's prayer at the consecration of the temple, 1 K. 8:23, "There is no God like thee, in heaven above or on earth beneath" (*'en kamokha 'elohim bashshamayim mimma'al ve'al ha'arets mittachath*). Here also what follows shows that the incomparability of Yahweh has to do with his relationship to Israel: "keeping covenant and showing *chesedh* (steadfast love) to thy servants who walk before thee with all their heart." But evidently the Deuteronomistic tradition has developed a type of monotheistic formula (or perhaps better, a formula of incomparability), which is based on the hymnic formula *mi kamokha,* "Who is like thee?"

Of course, there are other expressions that convey this idea, e.g., in Dt. 10:17: "Yahweh your God is God of gods and Lord of lords," i.e., the highest God and the most powerful Lord. But again the context emphasizes that the God who is lord of the whole world (v. 14) has loved and chosen Israel (v. 15), so that Israel must keep his commandments (v. 13).

Very much in harmony with this theoretically formulated principle, the Deuteronomistic history relates two conflicts between Yahweh and Baal in which the question is, Who is really God? In the first example, the question is merely mentioned in passing, viz., in Jgs. 6:31, where we read: "Is Baal a god?" i.e., does he really have divine power so that he can contend for himself? The problem is stated much more clearly in the encounter of Elijah with the prophets of Baal on Carmel (1 K. 18). Here the question, "Who is really God?" is explicitly raised, but again this means, "Which of these two gods (Yahweh and Baal) has the right to receive Israel's worship?" When Yahweh has shown his power by setting the sacrifice on fire, the people cry out: "Yahweh is God; Yahweh is God."

The assertions of Yahweh's incomparability reach their high point in Deutero-Isaiah. Although the prophet quite clearly is dependent on the hymnic tradition, he develops this motif independently. The interrogative form of the hymn is still found in Isa. 44:7: "Who is like me?" (*mi khamoni*). The context speaks of declaring beforehand what is going to happen (no one has done this like Yahweh), but then this conclusion is drawn: "Is there a God besides me?" (*hayesh 'eloah mibbal'adhai*) (v. 8). The interrogative form is also retained elsewhere, but the wording is different: 40:18: "To whom will you liken God (*'el*), or what likeness compare with him?"; 40:25: "To whom will you compare me, that I should be like him?"; 46:5: "To whom will you liken me and make me equal, and compare me?" Only in the last passage is an answer given: "For I am God, and there is no other; I am God, and there is none like me" (*ki 'anokhi 'el ve'en 'odh 'elohim ve'ephes kamoni,* 46:9). 43:10-13 is even more detailed:

Материал, защищенный авторским правом

אֱלִיל 'elîl

Contents: I. Occurrences. II. Etymology. III. Use in the OT.

I. Occurrences. The substantive *'elil,* which appears in the singular only in Isa. 10:10 (should *ha'elleh,* "these," be read here? This verse is probably a late insertion) and Zec. 11:17 (should we read *ha'evili,* "my foolish [shepherd]," here?), and everywhere else in the plural (Lev. 19:4; 26:1; Isa. 2:8,18,20; 10:11; 19:1,3; 31:7; Ezk. 30:13 [read here *'elim,* "gods," cf. the LXX]; Hab. 2:18; Ps. 96:5; 97:7; 1 Ch. 16:26; cf. also Sir. 30:19), is one of the words in the OT used to ridicule idols. The LXX renders it by *bdelýgmata,* "detestable things," *eídōla,* "idols," *daimónia,* "demons," *cheiropoíēta,* "made by human hands," and even by *theoús,* "gods," in Isa. 19:3. The Qumran texts also know the idea (1QM 14:1; cf. Isa. 19:1).[1]

II. Etymology. Since *'elil* is used with debilitating intention and with scornful undertones in all OT passages where it occurs, it seems to have been created expressly for this purpose. By true analogy with → גלולים *gillûlîm,* "dungy things, balls of dung," → שקוצים *shiqqûtsîm,* "horrible things, monsters," and perhaps also → תרפים *t^{e}rāphîm,* "the rotting things"? "old rags, scraps"? (cf. Ugar. *'ll,* "garment"?), words which are used to ridicule idols, and which also were consciously created to strike a discordant note with the sound of *'elohim, 'elil* (an Aramaizing form? Cf. *kesil* and *lamedh* as a diminutive ending)[2] was created as a disparaging pun on and as a diminutive of *'el* or *'elohim* (Ps. 97:7) ("little god, godling"). This helped to bring about a conscious antithesis between *'elil* and *'el,* "the Strong One." Furthermore, it is likely that the noun *'elil* is intentionally reminiscent of the adj. *'elil,* "weak, insignificant, worthless," which we also encounter in contexts where the speaker uses scornful words (Job 13:4; Jer. 14:14; cf. Zec. 11:17; also Sir. 11:3). We may also compare the Akk. *ulālu,* "powerless," Ugar. *ʒll,* "destruction,"[3] Syr. *'allîl,* "weak" and Arab. *'alāl,* "useless." It is unlikely that *'elil* was derived from the South Arab. *'l'lwt* or the Babylonian god Ellil.[4] But all attempts to derive *'elil* linguistically from the nations surrounding Israel run into difficulties, because in these nations we do

---

'elîl. W. W. Graf Baudissin, "Die Anschauung des AT von den Göttern des Heidentums," *Studien zur semitischen Religionsgeschichte,* I (1876), 102f.; R. H. Pfeiffer, "The Polemic against Idolatry in the OT," *JBL,* 43 (1924), 229-240; H. D. Preuss, *Verspottung fremder Religionen im AT. BWANT,* 92 (1971), 58, 136f., 139, 173, 240, 248-250, 281; H. Wildberger, *BK,* X, 102f., with additional literature on the etymology; see also the comms., esp. on Isa. 2:8 and Ps. 96:5.

1 On the adj., see below, II.

2 In addition, cf. R. Meyer, *Hebräische Grammatik,* II (^{3}1969), 28, 40.

3 So Driver, *CML,* but this is doubtful.

4 See Wildberger, 102.

I did violence.... There was no poor... or hungry in my time.... I gave to the widow just as I gave to the woman who had a husband, and never showed partiality in giving to the great more than to the small" (Ameni, 20; Document VII, 16).[5] The Eloquent Peasant compliments his judge Rensi as follows: "You are a father to the orphan, a husband to the widow, a brother to the divorced" (B 1, 63).[6] The same word *ḫ3r.t,* "widowed," is used figuratively of countries (Israel Stela, 27).

4. *Hittite.* In the Hittite texts, widows are seldom mentioned. Once the wife of the Egyptian king, Nebhururiya (Tutankhamen), who is mentioned in the Hittite text only with her Egyptian title *taḫamunzu,* "wife of the king," is called "widow" (*wannumiyaš*). Another text, which tells of the administration of a great (royal?) estate, contains an instruction to the major-domo to provide the widows with work so that they can earn their living (1966/c, line 7).[7] A collection of orders of the Hittite lord for the commandants of the provincial garrison contains the following instruction: When the commandant comes to a city on his circuit, he shall summon all who have legal claims and assemble them at the city gate; then he shall deal with the case of each to the satisfaction of the plaintiff. He must be particularly careful to give satisfaction to three groups, viz., the male slaves, the female slaves, and the widows.[8]

5. *Ugaritic and Phoenician.* In the Ugaritic epics, we encounter as an essential function of the king setting right (i.e., defending) the cause of the widow. In the Aqhat Epic, king Danel sits at the city gate and *ydn dn ʾlmnt yṯpṭ ṯpṭ ytm,* "he sets right the claim of the widow, he decides in favor of the orphan."[9] We see how important this royal function is in the accusation of the young prince Yaṣib, who reproves his royal father and says: "You do not set right the claim of the widow, or decide in favor of the oppressed (?)..., therefore step down from your kingdom that I may become king."[10] Phoenician texts from later centuries do not explicitly refer to this royal function. King Esmunʿazar of Sidon is called on his coffin inscription "orphan, son of a widow" (*ytm bn ʾlmt ʾnk*),[11] i.e., he was born after the death of his father.

II. Position of the Widow.

1. *Existence or Nonexistence of Children.* As has been said above, the term "widow" was used for the woman who had no financial support from an adult male member of her family (husband or grown son). When the husband of a married woman died, she became an *ʾalmanah,* "widow," and her children

---

5 Erman-Ranke, 105.
6 *ANET,* 408.
7 *ArOr,* 33 (1965), 337f.
8 *KUB,* XIII, 2, III, 29f.
9 *CTA,* 17 [II D], V, 7-9.
10 *CTA,* 16 [II K], VI, 33f., 37.
11 *KAI,* 14.3, 13.

เนื้อหาคุ้มครองลิขสิทธิ์

III. Protection and Care of the Widow. A widow's needs were of two kinds: protection against exploitation, and help in time of distress. These responsibilities to a woman, which under normal circumstances were the duty of her husband or father, were taken over by society in general when these two means of support were missing. But expressed religiously, it was said that God assumed this responsibility and put society under obligation to her. He was the protector of the widow and the father of her children (Ps. 68:6[5]). She was protected from her creditors and from the creditors of her deceased husband; they could take no pledge from her (Dt. 24:17; Job 24:3), nor could they regard her or her property as spoil (*shalal*) (Isa. 10:2). She received the benefit of the doubt in any civil suit (Ex. 22:21[22]; Dt. 10:18; 27:19; Isa. 1:17,23; 10:2; Jer. 7:6; 22:3; Zec. 7:10; Mal. 3:5). In addition to protection from exploitation, the widow enjoyed certain privileges, which represented a kind of social security. Every third year, the tithes of the agricultural products were supposed to be given to the widows, orphans, Levites, and sojourners (*ger*) (Dt. 14:28f.; 26:12f.). At the Feast of Weeks (16:11) and the Feast of Booths (16:14), widows and other poverty-stricken and dependent people received portions of food and wine with the families who were celebrating. Every year when the wheat and barley were harvested, and the grapes, olives, and other fruits were gathered, the gleanings of the fields, vineyards, and fruit trees were left for the poor, including widows (Lev. 19:9; Dt. 24:19-21; Ruth 2).

IV. Figurative Use of the Word. The word "widow" is frequently used in a figurative sense in all ancient Near Eastern literature. On the Israel Stele (line 27), the word *ḫ3r.t* is used to describe the plundered enemy lands. In Stymphalos, the goddess Hera, in harmony with her ancient character as a nature deity, was called *país,* "child, girl" (or *parthénos,* "virgin") in the spring, *teleía,* "full-grown," in the summer, and *chḗra,* "widow," in the winter (Pausanias viii.22.2). When God forsakes his people Israel and their land, they can be characterized as an *'almanah,* "widow" (Isa. 47:8), and their situation as *'almanuth,* "widowhood" (54:4).

Hoffner

Copyrighted material

a literary standpoint; if an original meaning is still possible at all, it must be deduced from the Hebrew rather than from the Syriac or Arabic. Of course, it is possible that old meanings were preserved in later languages. But in this case, it is difficult to determine whether the original meaning is closer to the Arabic and thus meant "faithful" or "secure," or to the Syriac and thus meant "enduring." Furthermore, we cannot confidently deduce the meaning of a word in the later development of a language even if we clearly establish the original meaning of that word. Thus, the meaning of the words derived from the root *ʾmn* can hardly be explained by determining its original meaning. And when we do not know the original meaning, the development of a word can lead us far from that meaning to something entirely different. The meaning of a word cannot be inferred from the (more or less certain) etymology, but only by a careful study of the way it is used in the language. [3]

II. Derivatives. The root *ʾmn* appears in the following forms:

1. As a verb in the qal, niphal, and hiphil. To be sure, it is a matter of debate whether the qal forms really belong to the root being treated here. Thus, in opposition to *GesB* and *KBL²*, Baumgartner assumes two different roots in *KBL³*.

2. As a noun: (a) in the form *ʾᵉmeth,* probably from *ʾamint*;[4] (b) in qaṭul or qᵉṭul forms: *ʾᵉmûnāh, ʾēmûn, ʾᵉmûnîm, ʾᵉmûnê*;[5] (c) in a segholate form following quṭl: *ʾômen,* fem. *ʾomnāh;* with adverbial ending, *ʾomnām, ʾumnām;* (d) in the form *ʾᵃmānāh.*

---

von האמין," *Hebräische Wortforschung. Festschrift W. Baumgartner. SVT,* 16 (1967), 284-290; A. Weiser, "Glauben im AT," *Festschrift G. Beer* (1935), 88-99; *idem,* "The Stem אמן and Related Expressions," *TDNT,* VI, 183-196; H. Wildberger, "Erwägungen zu האמין," *Hebräische Wortforschung. Festschrift W. Baumgartner. SVT,* 16, 372-386; *idem,* " 'Glauben' im AT," *ZThK,* 65 (1968), 129-159; E. Würthwein, "Jesaja 7,1-9," *Theologie als Glaubenswagnis. Festschrift K. Heim* (1954), 47-63.

On VI: R. Bultmann, "Der Begriff der Wahrheit im AT und unter alttestamentlichem Einfluss," *ZNW,* 27 (1928), 113-134; W. A. Irwin, "Truth in Ancient Israel," *JR,* 9 (1929), 357-388; L. J. Kuyper, "Grace and Truth," *Reformed Review,* 16/1 (1962), 1-16; D. Michel, "ʾÄmät. Untersuchung über 'Wahrheit' im Hebr.," *Archiv für Begriffsgeschichte,* 12 (1968), 30-57; E. T. Ramsdell, "The OT Understanding of Truth," *JR,* 31 (1951), 264-273.

On VII: M. A. Klopfenstein, *Die Lüge nach dem AT* (1964); E. Perry, "The Meaning of ᵉmuna in the OT," *JBR,* 21 (1953), 252-56; S. Virgulin, "La אמונה in Abacuc 2,4b," *Divus Thomas,* 99 (1969), 92-97.

On VIII: G. Dalman, *The Words of Jesus* (trans. 1909), 226-29; H. W. Hogg, "Amen," *JQR,* 9 (1897), 1ff.; A. R. Hulst, "Het woord 'Amen' in het OT," *Kerk en Eredienst,* 8 (1953), 50-68; I. Lande, *Formelhafte Wendungen der Umgangssprache im AT* (1954); E. Pfeiffer, "Der alttestamentliche Hintergrund der liturgischen Formel 'Amen,'" *KuD,* 4/2 (1958), 129-141.

[3] This is also emphasized by Pfeiffer, *KuD,* 131, in harmony with Albright and Delitzsch, even if it is not practiced in the *ZAW*.

[4] For particulars, see below, VI.

[5] See below, VII.

Material com direitos autorais

3. As an original adjectival form following qaṭil: *ʾāmēn*.[6]

Again, the extent to which these different derivatives have a similar meaning, or whether from time to time they have acquired a special meaning, can be determined only by studying the way they are used in the language.

III. Qal. The qal of the verb occurs clearly only in the active participle, in the masculine in Nu. 11:12; 2 K. 10:1,5; Est. 2:7; Isa. 49:23; and in the feminine in 2 S. 4:4; Ruth 4:16. It is used of men and women who are entrusted with the care of, or who take it upon themselves to care for, dependent children. 2 K. 10 must have to do with an official commission; the *ʾomenim* could hardly be guardians, but are probably those entrusted with the responsibility of leadership and education. Also, according to Est. 2:7 (cf. v. 20), Mordecai appears in the role of Esther's father and mother. Now, whether we wish to characterize him as a guardian or not, to Esther he is more than a provider and a guardian. The same is true of the women. In all likelihood, the *ʾomeneth* of the five-year-old Meribbaal did not nurse him, nor did Naomi nurse Obed. Rather, in the former (and perhaps also in the latter) case, it is to be assumed that this woman had the responsibility of taking care of the child. The child has been entrusted "to faithful hands," or like Naomi, she assumed the responsibility of caring for him.

Moses denies that he has the kind of responsibility toward Israel that an *ʾomen* has toward a child (Nu. 11:12). But kings must accept the responsibility of "caring for" Israel when they return home from Babylonian captivity (Isa. 49:23).

ʾomnah, "care" (Est. 2:20), fits the meaning "a man who cares for, a woman who cares for." But if this is indeed the meaning of the qal participle, it is not necessary to separate these forms from the other forms of the root *ʾmn*. Perhaps the qal participle has taken on a special meaning, that of responsible care, but still its connection with the other forms of *ʾmn* is quite discernible.

The suggestion of Albright[7] that *ʾomenim* is to be derived from Akk. *ummānu*, with which Baumgartner seems to agree, cannot be justified by the form or the meaning of the word; and so the reason for assuming that the qal forms of *ʾmn* are from a special root, which is so crucial to Baumgartner's position, is gone also.

IV. Niphal.

1. *Forms.* The niphal of the root *ʾmn* appears predominantly in the participle–32 times, while it is found in the perfect only 5 times and in the imperfect 8 times. We must omit Hos. 5:9 and 12:1 (Eng. 11:12) from these passages as unintelligible or corrupt.[8] We should probably also omit 1 Ch. 17:24 for the same reason, but one should read Rudolph's comments on this passage.[9] Thus,

---

[6] See below, VIII.
[7] Albright, *BASOR*, 94 (1944), 18, n. 28.
[8] Cf. comms. *in loc.*
[9] Rudolph, *HAT*, 21 (1955), *in loc.*

Material com direitos autorais

b. *ne'eman* is used only a few times to refer to the relationship of individuals to God, again probably indicating that these are being emphasized in a particular way. It is applied to Abraham in Neh. 9:8, where it says in the prayer of the community: "Thou didst find his heart *ne'eman,* 'faithful,' before thee," i.e. probably, completely devoted to thee. It is uncertain whether this alludes to Abraham's faith in Gen. 15:6 or to his behavior in Gen. 22. Sir. 44:20 would seem to favor the latter view, for it says: *benisuy nimtsa' ne'eman,* "when he was tested he was found *ne'eman,*" i.e., faithful, loyal, reliable. (This wording is also presupposed in 1 Macc. 2:52, where *pistós* occurs.) Since there is no priest whose behavior can be said to be *ne'eman,* "faithful," God must raise up a priest on whom he can rely (1 S. 2:35). The refining of God makes it necessary for a citizenship (*qiryah,* "city") which was at one time steadfast, loyal, and reliable to God to become so again (Isa. 1:21,26). It is clear that a personal relationship is intended here too.

The precise translation of two other statements that belong here is debated, viz., the words concerning Moses in Nu. 12:7, and the words concerning Samuel in 1 S. 3:20. One possibility is that *ne'eman* is to be understood as "reliable," as above. In this case, it is said of Moses: in contrast to Aaron and Miriam, he is faithful and loyal in my whole house; and of Samuel: all Israel knew that Samuel was faithful as a prophet of Yahweh. However, both statements fit into the context very poorly. Therefore, some scholars have suggested that the participial forms here should be understood more like verbs: "he is entrusted, he is authorized." In this case, Nu. 12:7 would mean: "He (alone) is entrusted with all my house"; and 1 S. 3:20: "... that Samuel was appointed as a prophet of Yahweh." [11] No objection can be made to such a verbal meaning in itself; however, the derivation from *'mn* causes difficulties. But in both cases it is clear that a statement was made about Moses and Samuel which expressed a unique relationship to the deity, indeed, a special divine evaluation of these two men. [12]

c. *ne'eman* appears more often with regard to the promise made concerning the dynasty of David. This is stated in different ways. 2 S. 7:16 and 1 S. 25:28 state that his house shall be *ne'eman,* "sure"; Ps. 89:38(37) says his descendants shall be *ne'eman;* 89:29(28) says God's *berith,* "covenant" = "promise," shall be *ne'eman*; and Isa. 55:3 states that the tokens of God's love for David are *ne'eman*. Only translations like "continuous, enduring, lasting," are suitable here, as is confirmed by the parallel *ʿolam,* "ever," in the last three passages. The promise made to the house of the priest whom God raised up (1 S. 2:35), and the one made to the house of Jeroboam I (1 K. 11:38), are probably both derived from this promise made to the house of David. In all three cases, it is assumed that the durability of a house is not a natural thing, but is guaranteed

---

11 So according to the older commentators; cf. Calmet *in loc.,* Klostermann, Hertzberg, *GesB, KBL*[3], etc.

12 On the difficulties of the textual continuity of 1 S. 3:19-21, cf. the comms., esp. Klostermann, Budde, and Caspari.

Material chroniony prawem autorskim

by a promise of God. Such promises of God also have durability and permanency. [13]

d. Israel's conduct, as it is described in Ps. 78:8,37, stands in contrast to the conduct of God. Here also, as in the other three passages that use the perfect, the most obvious meaning is "to be *ne'eman*." In both verses *ne'eman* stands in parallelism to: "Their (his) heart was not steadfast (*nakhon*)"; therefore a translation like "they were not faithful" is the most natural. V. 37 would then read: "Their heart was not steadfast toward him and they were not faithful to his promise." V. 8 could also fit in with this understanding with its statement about the stubborn and rebellious generation: "a generation whose heart was not steadfast and whose spirit was not faithful to God."

4. *Imperfect.* The seven forms of the niphal imperfect may be divided into two groups. In five passages, the imperfect is connected with *dabhar,* "word." First of all, we may mention Gen. 42:20; here Joseph has his brothers prove that their word to him was "true, reliable," thus that a person could rely on their word. The other passages speak of the word of God. First we may note 1 K. 8:26, where Solomon prays that God's promise to David might prove to be a reliable word. The Chronicler takes over this passage (2 Ch. 6:17), and inserts the same formula in his reproduction of 1 K. 3:6 in 2 Ch. 1:9, and of 2 S. 7:25 in 1 Ch. 17:23. The Chronicler seems to have attached particular importance to the fact that God's word, his promise, should be fulfilled, and thus prove to be reliable. Thus, "to prove to be reliable" would probably be the best rendering of this formula. But we still need to discuss Isa. 7:9 and its reproduction in 2 Ch. 20:20, which can be interpreted best in connection with the hiphil forms.

5. *Meaning.* This analysis of the linguistic use of the niphal has shown that the niphal forms of *'mn* are used very predominantly of God and man, or of what they say, while they are used of things very rarely. Therefore, Weiser is probably using a *petitio principii* (a fallacious approach) when he begins with the passages in which the niphal forms are used of things, develops a formal idea from these, and then applies this idea to the uses of these forms with regard to persons. Following Weiser, Ebeling reaches the conclusion that *ne'eman* means "that a thing corresponds to what it promises to be." [14] On the contrary, virtually all that can be determined from the use of the word is that when *ne'eman* is used of things, a meaning like "lasting, continual," is to be assumed, but when it is used of persons, it means "reliable." In neither case is a specific quality in view, namely, what the thing or person promises to be. Neither sicknesses and afflictions, nor water, nor even a dynasty promises to endure. Rather, one could say that that which is not specific, indeed that which is unexpected, is declared in promise ("house") and threat ("afflictions"), viz., that a dynasty will continue, or

---

[13] See below on Isa. 7:9.
[14] Ebeling, 208.

Material chroniony prawem autorskim

that a disease will not cease. The personal use conveys even less the idea of something specific: that the priests of Nehemiah are faithful is not an evaluation of their priesthood, but of their persons, and the same applies to other persons and groups of persons mentioned. When *ne'eman* is used, it always indicates something special, not something obviously to be expected.

If one were to try to find a translation in English that would embrace the different meanings of this word, the closest would probably be "constant," which can include both the permanency of things and the stability and reliability of persons. The result is that one may build or rely upon the thing or person giving proof of constancy.

V. Hiphil.

1. *Problem.* The problem of the hiphil form can be seen clearly by examining the various translations and explanations that have been suggested for this word. A selection of some of the views that have been proposed should make the issues clear.

Pedersen writes: "To make a man true, *he'emin,* means the same as to rely on him. It implies confidence in his having the will and power to maintain the claims of the covenant. . . . The weaker members of the covenant help to uphold the stronger by their confidence. They *make* him 'true,' i.e., firm, sure, and strong"; "to consider a soul firm and thus to contribute to its firmness, that is to 'make true,' to believe in it." [15]

Eichrodt says: "In several passages the word *he'emin,* 'to consider firm, trustworthy, to find to be reliable,' is used to describe this (positive) relationship; and it does indeed very happily strike the exact note of the adventurous attitude toward God." And in a footnote he adds: "Since the basic meaning of the root *'mn* in Arabic is 'to be secure, out of danger,' one could choose as the preferable translation of the Heb. *he'emin,* 'to regard as assured,' 'to find security in.'"[16]

Weiser paraphrases: "To say Amen to something with all the consequences that this involves for object and subject," and then comments: "The concept *'mn* relates the totality of the manifestations of human life to the relationship with God." [17] Ebeling concludes from this: "The Hiph. form האמין has, in the causative or declarative sense, the meaning: to let something be נאמן or declare it to be נאמן, that is, to let it be valid or adjudge that it corresponds to what it promises." [18]

On the other hand, von Rad says: "In Hebrew 'to have faith' is literally 'to make oneself secure in Yahweh' (hence the prep. *be* after *he'emin*). But the object to which, according to Gen. 15:6, Abraham directed his faith is–as is usual in the OT–something in the future." [19]

---

[15] *ILC,* 347; cf. also 348.
[16] Eichrodt, *TheolOT,* II (trans. 1967), 276.
[17] Weiser, *TDNT.*
[18] Ebeling, 209.
[19] Von Rad, *OT Theol,* I (trans. 1962), 171.

Material chroniony prawem autorskim

seeing wonders and signs (in contrast to the Israelites, who believed when they saw signs and wonders, Ex. 4:31; 14:31); they believed wholly on the basis of the word of Jonah. The translation, "they believed in God," weakens the idea somewhat. It would be better to paraphrase the idea this way: They took Jonah's message seriously as a message which actually came from God, although nothing is said about God in Jonah's message. As a result of this, they fasted, put on garments symbolizing their penitent attitude, and (v. 10) turned from their evil way. Thus, it is the intention of this narrator to show that a metropolis (3:3) whose wickedness was so great that God felt compelled to destroy it (1:2) accepted the word of God which was preached to it, considered it to be true, and was willing to do all that it required. It is almost as if the narrator wanted to say: I have not found such faith in Israel. It is not without reason that Mt. 12:41 referred to this behavior of the Ninevites. A third positive statement appears in Gen. 15:6: *vehe'emin bayhvh vayyachshebheha lo tsedhaqah*. This statement is fundamental to the evaluation of Abraham in Judaism and Christianity.[32] It forms the conclusion of a brief promise of Yahweh to Abraham that his descendants would be as numerous as the stars of heaven. It would be necessary to divide this section into sources in order to put this statement about Abraham's faith in a historical setting. However, such a source analysis is almost impossible here. There is no real justification for assigning this statement to E, as has often been proposed. It is more likely that this section is a late insertion with a strong theological character.[33] All we can do, then, is to investigate the meaning of this statement apart from its historical setting.

This much is clear: Abraham reacts to the promise of Yahweh and its allusion to the stars by taking this promise of God seriously, by relying on it, or to be more specific, by relying on God and by believing that he is able to fulfil his promise. Although it is often very difficult to trust in man, it is still possible to trust in God. This is the only possible right conduct toward God, and therefore it is recognized by God as such. Thus, it is clear from this passage what the right conduct toward God is in the view of this narrative (*tsedhaqah*, "righteousness"): trusting in him, relying on his promise without doubting, indeed contrary to all appearance. The real meaning of Abraham's "belief" in this passage has been the subject of much discussion among Jews and Christians (cf. in the NT, Rom. 4:3; Jas. 2:23).

The special importance of such rare statements about faith is also clear in that among the prophets Isaiah alone dares to use the word *he'emin* in his preaching, and then only twice (7:9; 28:16). Of course, the precise interpretation of both passages is greatly debated. This is largely because in both cases the word *he'emin* is used absolutely, which makes it necessary to ask whether something like "in God" must be supplied in the text, or whether the absolute use is intelligible as it stands. Since *he'emin* is used absolutely elsewhere in the OT (although admittedly very rarely), it is necessary to begin by studying these passages. Ex. 4:31 says: The people gained confidence; and in Job 29:24 we

---

[32] Cf. *TDNT*, *s.v.* Ἀβραάμ.
[33] Cf. Kaiser, *ZAW*, 70 (1958), 101ff.

Material chroniony prawem autorskim

are not so easy to find. Therefore also, it is not surprising that Joseph declares that he would first have to test the words of his brothers before he could know whether there was really *ʾemeth* in them (Gen. 42:16).

e. In the last passage, *ʾemeth* is a value which can and should be in a man. Therefore, it is understandable that admonitions to *ʾemeth* and laments over its absence occur about the same number of times in the OT. Once the OT admonishes people to speak *ʾemeth*, i.e., probably, to speak that on which people can rely: "Speak *ʾemeth* to one another" (Zec. 8:16). The OT promises that the reliable tongue will endure (Prov. 12:19). Instruction should consist of words of *ʾemeth* (22:21). It is the highest praise when words of *ʾemeth* are attributed to the Preacher (Eccl. 12:10).

Second, justice should be carried out in *ʾemeth:* "Render in your gates judgments that are *ʾemeth* . . ." (Zec. 8:16); and "Render a *mishpat ʾemeth*" (7:9), i.e., judgments that are in accordance with *ʾemeth*, with the actual facts, so that they prove to be right and just. Cf. also Ezk. 18:8f., where one characteristic of the *tsaddiq*, "righteous," is that of executing a judgment of *ʾemeth*. A witness is also essential in a legal judgment: An *ʿedh ʾemeth*, i.e., a witness on whose testimony one can depend, who speaks the truth, saves lives (Prov. 14:25). Witnesses should appear and say: *ʾemeth*, this is the truth! (Isa. 43:9). In Jer. 42:5, Yahweh himself is called upon as "a true and faithful witness."

The king in particular is advised to practice *ʾemeth*. If a king judges the poor in *ʾemeth*, his throne will be established for ever (Prov. 29:14). Thus, *chesedh*, "loyalty," and *ʾemeth* will preserve him (20:28; cf. also Ps. 61:8[7]), i.e., uphold his throne. [44]

But in spite of all admonitions, Jeremiah is compelled to lament: "No one speaks the truth; they have taught their tongue to speak lies" (9:4[5]). And (Deutero-)Isa. 48:1 speaks of those "who swear by the name of Yahweh, and confess the God of Israel, but not in *ʾemeth*," i.e., one cannot rely on their oath.

f. In addition to these concrete admonitions to speak and perform reliable words, judgments, and oaths, *ʾemeth* is also used in a general sense as something of the highest value, which man should seek. Thus Prov. 23:23 admonishes: "Buy *ʾemeth*, and do not sell it." Here *ʾemeth* is mentioned in parallelism with wisdom, instruction, and understanding, and thus it is considered to be one of the elements essential to human life. Similarly, 3:3 urges: "Let not *chesedh* (loyalty) and *ʾemeth* forsake you; bind them about your neck, write them on the tablet of your heart." *ʾemeth* belongs to the heart, i.e., to the innermost nature of man. Thus, this admonition appears in Zec. 8:19: "Love *ʾemeth* and peace." Also, one thing that is mentioned in the OT picture of the future is that *ʾemeth* will spring up from the ground, and *chesedh*, "steadfast love," and *ʾemeth* will meet (Ps. 85:11f.[10f.]).

---

[44] On the same idea transferred to God in Ps. 89:15(14), see below. The extent to which Isa. 16:5 belongs in the same category is uncertain in light of the very controversial exegesis of Isa. 15f.; cf. on this Rudolph in *Hebrew and Semitic Studies Presented to G. R. Driver* (1963), 130ff.

เนื้อหาคุ้มครองลิขสิทธิ์

steadfast love and thy faithfulness ever preserve me" (40:12[11]). Thus, we find the prayer: "Let me walk in thy faithfulness" (25:5; similarly 26:3; 86:11); for: "All the paths of Yahweh are steadfast love and faithfulness, for those who keep his covenant and his testimonies" (25:10), i.e., he leads them in active kindness and faithfulness. Abraham's servant learns this (Gen. 24:27,48), and he thanks God because he did not withhold his kindness and faithfulness from his master, but led him (the servant) in the "right" way, directing him reliably to his goal. The psalmist prays for this kind of escort: "O send out thy light and thy *'emeth,* let them lead me" (Ps. 43:3). As light illuminates the way, God's *'emeth* (i.e., God in his reliability) leads in the right way. In expectation of reliable deliverance, the worshipper in 69:14(13) prays that God will give him an answer. But the community of Mic. 7:20 expects God's "faithfulness" and "kindness," which in time past he had sworn to the fathers.

Since Yahweh is a God on whom one can rely completely (both on his words and on his deeds), this *'emeth* of God is the object of praise in the OT: "I will also praise thee with the harp for thy faithfulness, O my God" (Ps. 71:22); "the father makes known to the children thy faithfulness" (Isa. 38:19). The extent to which this praise is a vital element of prayer in the OT is shown in that different Israelites remind God that the dead can no longer praise him for his *'emeth* (Ps. 30:10[9]; Isa. 38:18). Thus it is in the hymn that God's *chesedh* and *'emeth* stand side by side as the objects of man's confession of praise to God: Ps. 40:11(10); 117:2; 57:11(10); 108:5(4); 115:1; 138:2.

But such a God is not one God among many, but he is the "true" God, besides whom none other has any claim to deity, as is made clear in the late passage, Jer. 10:10. And the preacher-prophet of 2 Ch. 15:3 describes the time without the "true" God as the "godless," terrible time. The God on whom one can rely, and he alone, is the one true God (the text of Ps. 54:7[5] and 57:4[3] is uncertain).

Since God is an *'el 'emeth,* man's relationship to this God is possible only through *'emeth*. Whether it is a matter of walking before God (1 K. 2:4), calling upon him (Ps. 145:18), or swearing by his name (Jer. 4:2), it must always be done *be'emeth,* honestly, genuinely, reliably. Only the person who, among other things, "speaks *'emeth* in his heart," who means it honestly and genuinely from the bottom of his heart, has access to God's holy hill (Ps. 15:2). This explains the admonitions of Joshua (Josh. 24:14) and Samuel (1 S. 12:24): "Fear the Lord and serve him *be'emeth,* reliably."

But in view of man's situation treated under 4 above, it is not surprising that such an attitude of man toward God is expressed only rarely. Thus, the prayer is put in the mouth of Hezekiah: "Remember now, O Yahweh, I beseech thee, how I have walked before thee with a genuine and sincere heart" (Isa. 38:3; 2 K. 20:3). Similarly, Solomon speaks of his father, "who walked before thee in faithfulness" (1 K. 3:6); and the Chronicler says of Hezekiah: "He did what was good and right and faithful before Yahweh his God" (2 Ch. 31:20). Only once does a prophet put in the mouth of God the judgment: "Sincere instruction was in his (the priest's) mouth" (Mal. 2:6); but what once was has long ago passed away. Thus, looking retrospectively, OT writers dared attribute sincerity,

Copyrighted material

b. The use of *'amen* in Dt. 27:15ff.; Nu. 5:22; and Neh. 5:13 is different. All three passages have to do with curses that are uttered and then accepted by saying "Amen." Dt. 27:15ff. contains curses uttered against those who commit secret sins and thus are not brought before human judges. By this curse ceremony, they are handed over to the divine court of justice. But when the people say "Amen," they acknowledge that this curse is to become effective against anyone who transgresses secretly or otherwise. In the same way, the priest in Nu. 5:21f. hands over the accused woman to God's court of justice: "The Lord make you...." But the woman places herself under this divine judgment by saying "Amen." In Neh. 5:13, Nehemiah utters a curse formula: "So may God shake out every man who...." But the assembly takes this curse upon itself by saying "Amen."

Thus in both groups of passages "Amen" is an acknowledgment that the divine word is an active force: May it happen in just this way. The extent to which this use can be said to be cultic or liturgical is yet to be decided, because (with the exception of Nu. 5) these passages have to do with specific incidents. But it is clear that the "Amen" has reference to words and deeds of God, to which the speaker submits himself.

c. In the third place, *'amen* is used in passages that praise God. So we find in Neh. 8:6: "And Ezra blessed Yahweh, the great God; and all the people answered, 'Amen, Amen,' lifting up their hands." Here for the first time "Amen" is attested as a response of the community to a prayer. It seems that by using "Amen" the community makes the prayer (in this text in particular the prayer of praise) its own. It is not clear whether the community is following an already existing custom here, or whether this incident is related because it presents something new. In any case, the custom of responding to a prayer of praise by saying "Amen" came into vogue, as is indicated by 1 Ch. 16:36, where it is put back into the time of David. This is further confirmed by the fact that it was used in the Synagogue (*Ber.* v.4; viii.8), and that it was taken over by Primitive Christianity (1 Cor. 14:16).

d. From this use in public worship has probably arisen the practice of ending individual books of the Bible with an ascription of praise to God and its accompanying "Amen." This may be shown especially in the books into which the psalms have been collected. That the doxologies at the end of Pss. 41, 72, 89, and 106 are different allows one to reach only one conclusion, viz., that the complete book of Psalms was not divided into five books at a later time, but that at least the first three books were provided with concluding doxologies before they were brought together. That the psalms that were inserted later (perhaps at first only 90–119) were then subdivided at Ps. 106 may have its basis in the present account in 1 Ch. 16.[58] In any case these concluding verses, in which

---

[58] Cf. further Gunkel-Begrich, *Einl. in die Psalmen* (1933), 438ff.; Rudolph, comm. on 1 Ch. 16 (*HAT*, 21).

"Amen" occurs once or twice, form a unit, and thus "Amen" is not a later addition, as Kraus seems to assume in his comments on Ps. 41.

For the scribes, the confirmatory "Amen" was an essential element in prayers of praise to God, and they added "Amen" themselves. The later scribes (if not the authors) of Tobit, 3 and 4 Maccabees, and many manuscripts of the Gospels took over this use of "Amen" from the ancient books of psalms.

Thus, what was said later about "Amen" among the Amoreans can also be said about it in the OT: "Amen is affirmation, Amen is curse, Amen is making something one's own." [59] When he utters the word "Amen," the hearer affirms the wish that God may act, places himself under divine judgment, and joins in praise to God.

e. The text of Isa. 65:16 and 25:1 is difficult. *be'lohe 'amen* is often emended to *be'lohe 'emun* or *be'lohe 'omen* both times this expression appears in 65:16, because it hardly seems that the MT can be translated "the God of the Amen." However, it should be observed that *'amen* was in the Hebrew text used by Aquila, for he translates by *pepistōménōs* here, which is how he always renders *'amen* (cf. Nu. 5:22; Dt. 27:15; Ps. 41:13; 72:19; 89:53[52]; Jer. 11:5). The reading *'amen* in Isa. 65:16 is also attested by Symmachus, who transliterates it in this passage. Therefore, it has been assumed (probably correctly) that Rev. 3:14 presupposes the same tradition when it reads *ho amḗn*. Thus the Massoretic pointing of Isa. 65:16 goes back to an ancient tradition, and should not be rejected so quickly. It is uncertain whether the LXX translation *tón theón tón alēthinón,* "the true God," assumes a different Hebrew text or represents an attempt to paraphrase *'elohe 'amen*. On the other hand, in Isa. 25:1 the LXX translation *génoito* presupposes an *'amen* after *'emunah*. Aquila assumes that this is the case with his reading *pepistōménōs*. However, by reading *pístei* Symmachus seems to be translating a form like *'emun* or *'omen*. Thus, at a very early period both passages were read in different ways. But in Isa. 25:1 *'amen* can hardly be translated intelligibly, while the Massoretic reading *'omen* can probably be understood as a strengthening of *'emunah*. On the other hand, *'amen* is probably to be preferred in Isa. 65:16; that *'amen* is connected with *barekh,* "to bless," in Neh. 8:6, and with *nishbaʿ*, "to curse," in Nu. 5:22, certainly favors the view that here also blessing and cursing are meant to be connected with the God of "Amen." This would mean that blessing and curse should be uttered by the God who confirms blessing and cursing, because he also says "Amen" to his own word and stands by it. [60] This expression may have been taken up in Rev. 3:14, where Christ is called *ho amḗn*. [61]

IX. Summary. When a Hebrew heard the various words derived from the root *'mn,* the basic idea that came to his mind was apparently "constancy." When they were used of things, they meant "continual"; and when they were

---

[59] Dalman, *The Words of Jesus,* 226.

[60] Cf. Delitzsch, *comm. in loc.;* and Pfeiffer, *KuD*.

[61] On the question of whether Jesus, when he used "Amen," understood it as a word of divine omnipotence, cf. J. Jeremias, *Abba* (1966), 148ff.

Material com direitos autorais

אָמַר *ʾāmar;* **אֹמֶר** *ʾōmer;* **אֵמֶר** *ʾēmer;*
אִמְרָה *ʾimrāh;* **אֶמְרָה** *ʾemrāh;*
מַאֲמָר *maʾᵃmār;* **מֵאמַר** *mēʾmar*

Contents: I. The Root: 1. Etymology and Occurrences; 2. Meaning and Radius of Function. II. General Use: 1. A Communication Term; 2. A Term That Signifies; 3. A Term for Imputation; 4. Thinking and Reflecting; 5. *lēʾmōr*. III. Theological Use: 1. Term for Revelation: a. *ʾamar* in Connection with God Identifying Himself; b. The Creative Word; c. Demand; d. Encouragement; 2. Messenger Formula and Messenger Oracle; 3. Man Speaking to God. IV. Derivatives: 1. *ʾomer*; 2. *ʾemer, maʾamar,* Aram. *meʾmar*; 3. *ʾimrah, ʾemrah.*

I. The Root.

1. *Etymology and Occurrences.* *ʾmr* is a common Semitic root, which can mean "to be bright," "to be visible," "to make visible," "to see," or "to inform." [1] The etymological connection between Ugar. *ʾmr* I, "to be visible," "to see," [2] and Heb. *ʾmr* is no longer disputed. [3] However, there is still discussion as to whether Akk. *amāru,* "to see," and Ethiop. *ʾammara,* "to show," belong to the linguistic history of Heb. *ʾmr*. In Hebrew and Biblical Aramaic (as well as in the Mesha Stela) the original meaning recedes entirely, giving way to the concept "to say" in the sense of imparting information. We encounter *ʾmr* in the verb form throughout the OT, in both early and late texts, and in all conceivable literary connections. Its use is not limited to specific types and forms. In both the Hebrew and Aramaic sections of the OT the verb form of *ʾmr* appears about 5300 times. [4] *ʾmr* is found almost exclusively in the qal (or Aram. peal). In the few instances in which it appears in the niphal, it is to be understood passively or impersonally (in the sense of "one says, it is said"). There are only two examples of its use in the hiphil, and both of them occur in the same context

---

ʾāmar. P. R. Ackroyd, "The Vitality of the Word of God in the OT," *ASTI,* 1 (1962), 7-23; J. Barth, *Wurzeluntersuchungen zum hebr. und aram. Lexicon* (1902); M. Dahood, "Hebrew-Ugaritic Lexicography I," *Bibl,* 44 (1963), 289-303; F. Delitzsch, *Prolegomena eines neuen hebr.-aram. Wörterbuchs zum AT* (1886); L. Dürr, *Die Wertung des göttlichen Wortes im AT und im Antiken Orient. MVÄG,* 42/1 (1938); A. Ehrman, "A Note on the Verb אמר," *JQR,* 55 (1964/65), 166f.; O. Grether, *Name und Wort Gottes im AT. BZAW,* 64 (1934); V. Hamp, *Der Begriff "Wort" in den aramäischen Bibelübersetzungen* (Munich, 1938); O. Procksch, *TDNT,* IV, 91-100; F. Rundgren, "Hebräisch *bäṣär* 'Golderz' und *ʾāmar* 'sagen.' Zwei Etymologien," *Or,* 32 (1963), 178-183; C. Westermann, *Basic Forms of Prophetic Speech* (trans. 1967).

1 *KBL*; Rundgren; Delitzsch, 28, n. 1.
2 Cf. *WUS*³, 25, No. 283; cf. with No. 284.
3 Cf. Dahood, 295f.
4 According to *KBL*³.

Матеріал, захищений авторським правом

(Dt. 26:17,18). Here *ʾmr* is to be interpreted primarily in the causative sense, but from this meaning comes the use of this form in the sense of an official, binding statement.[5] In Mishnaic Hebrew, the causative form means "to betroth."[6] *ʾamar* is frequently used with → דבר *dibbēr*. Often these two words are used synonymously, but they are also used synthetically: *dibber* is used first to announce or declare to the reader that someone is going to speak, then *ʾamar* is used to indicate that the speaker's words follow immediately, and this may be done in the style of direct or indirect discourse, e.g., we find in Gen. 19:14(J), "... Lot spoke ... and said ..." (*vayedhabber ... vayyoʾmer;* but quite often this idea is expressed by Heb. *vayedhabber ... leʾmor;* cf. also Isa. 7:10; 8:5, *vayyoseph dabber leʾmor*). *ʾamar* is also used in other passages to indicate that the speaker's words follow immediately, where *ʾamar* follows verbs like → קרא *qārāʾ*, "to call," → ענה *ʿānāh*, "to answer," → נגד *nāghadh*, "to announce," → שאל *shāʾal*, "to ask," → צוה *tsivvāh*, "to command," etc., and appears after expressions like *hayah dabhar ʾel*, "the word came unto," e.g., in Jer. 1:4. The nouns built from the root *ʾmr*, viz., *ʾomer, ʾemer, ʾimrah, ʾemrah, maʾamar*, and Aram. *meʾmar*, correspond in meaning to the ordinary sense of the verb in the OT, and thus are to be translated "saying," "speech," "announcement," and "word," and less frequently like *dabhar*, "matter," "thing," "affair" (Job 22:28). The noun forms from the root *ʾmr* occur approximately 100 times in the OT, and are found primarily, although not exclusively, in late and poetic (wisdom) texts.[7]

2. *Meaning and Radius of Function.* *ʾamar* has a very diverse breadth of meaning, and the variety of its nuances of meaning is exceptionally rich. In the German language, compound words built from the same root often provide a striking clue to the variety of meanings in Hebrew words and their uses in different contexts; and indeed, if we look at the various German compounds with *sagen*, "to say," we find that these correspond with the various meanings of *ʾamar*, e.g.: *ansagen* (to announce), *aussagen* (to state, declare), *zusagen* (to promise), *absagen* (to refuse), *vorhersagen* (to predict), *nachsagen* (to repeat), etc. But in order to convey correctly the wide variety of meanings connected with *ʾamar*, it is necessary to use many other German words which are not built from *sagen*, e.g., *mitteilen* (to inform), *nennen* (to name, call), *benennen* (to name, call), *erwähnen* (to mention), *zusichern* (to assure, promise), *widersprechen* (to contradict, oppose), *antworten* (to answer), *rühmen* (to praise), *lästern* (to slander), *befehlen* (to command), *zu sich selber* (or *zu seinem Herzen*) *sagen* (to speak to oneself [or to one's own heart]), *denken* (to think), *überlegen* (to reflect, consider), *erwägen* (to consider), *erörtern* (to discuss), *deuten* (to explain), *bedeuten* (to mean), etc.

ʾamar always indicates reasonable statements by a subject which may be heard and understood by others.

---

[5] Cf. R. Smend, *Bundesformel* (1963), 7f., in agreement with Ben Yehuda, *Thesaurus,* I (1960), 297: "to proclaim."

[6] See *KBL;* cf. *GesB*.

[7] See below, IV.1-3.

Bahan dengan hak cipta

indicated by what is said. Until the *'amar*, that which is said, takes place, a wide variety of activities occur in the realm of personal relationships from the most sublime reflection on one's own attitude to the active deed. Sometimes these activities speak an intelligible language of their own, and thus are regarded as a function of *'amar* or are themselves the execution of *'amar*.

The relationships between *'amar* and its objects are also diverse and have many dimensions. They cover a wide range of things which are defined by *'amar*. One can talk about anything, and can make anything the object of "speaking": love and hate, turning to and turning from, claim and promise, judgment and pardon, law and order, action and conduct, cursing and blessing, war and peace, wounding and healing, sin and confession, demanding and offering, joy and grief, revealing and hiding, information and communication, etc.

This should help us understand why it is difficult to make *'amar* fit into a neatly worked out pattern, for the meaning and radius of function of *'amar* are best characterized as extensive, transparent, many dimensional, and complex.

II. General Use. The general and theological uses of *'amar* in the OT cannot be distinguished from each other as far as function is concerned. The distinction lies in the subject-object relationships. Here, of course, subject and object function in their own unique way, and yet not every subject or every object functions in the same way. However, OT Hebrew does not use one term for God speaking to man, another for man speaking to God, and still a third for man speaking to his fellow man. The general and theological uses both share in the broad radius of function outlined under I above, and in the widely divergent meaning of *'amar*. What is about to be said about the general use also applies *mutatis mutandis* to the theological use.

1. *A Communication Term.* *'amar* is used to denote communication between two personal entities (or entities regarded as personal). The goal of *'amar* is that another person (or persons) might hear and understand, and might reply, in the broadest sense of the word (reaction). *'amar* is used in dialogues (Gen. 3). In these instances, *'amar* is construed with prepositions (*'el, le, ʿal*) to indicate the object of the verb. The refusal to accept that which is proposed, in contexts using *'amar*, only confirms the communicative intention of the *'amar*-event (Nu. 20:14-21). The communicative aspect of *'amar* in covenant-making (e.g., Josh. 9:6ff.), marriage contracts (Gen. 24), explanatory statements (2:22,23), invitations (45:17), bearing a message (45:9), etc., is instructive. The subject of *'amar* is stated and in this way offered to the community. In OT legends, there are passages in which *'amar* is used in connection with a person's intentions, ideas, desires, and sentiments (e.g., in Jgs. 9:1-6, where it appears in connection with *dibber*). Communication occurs and becomes reality in the "response" (again, often expressed by *'amar*) (9:3). This aspect of the use of *'amar* is particularly clear in passages in which a person is identifying himself (Gen. 45:3f.; this use of *'amar* prevails throughout chap. 45).[9] On the other hand, to refrain from speak-

[9] Cf. also the formal expressions in passages in which God identifies himself; see below.

le'mor introduces direct or indirect discourse (on the latter, cf. 1 Ch. 21:18), and therefore has often crystallized into a formula, conjunction, or introductory particle (Gen. 34:4). In English, then, it is best to render *le'mor* by a subordinate clause: "as he (or some other subject) said (spoke, talked, etc.)." Since it is usually found after verbs of saying (*'amar, dibber, naghadh, zaʿaq, ʿanah, tsivvah, tsaʿaq, sha'al,* etc.) or nouns that are cognate with them (*dabhar, mitsvah, tseʿaqah,* etc.), it can also be translated more simply by "in the following manner," "as follows," "thus," or "so." Like the Gk. *hóti,* it sometimes represents a colon (Josh. 1:10-13).

Of course, *le'mor* also appears after verbs which primarily have nothing to do with "speaking." Here the word-event indicated by *le'mor* is integrated into the entire event designated by the main verb. The word-event can be a motivation for the main verb, or one of its consequences, or it can further the course of the main event; in each of these constructions, *le'mor* has to be translated in a different way. The *'amar*-deed expressed by *le'mor* has the function of interpreting or defining, and conversely sometimes it is clarified by the main verb on which it depends. The man of God from Judah gives a sign in Bethel followed by its interpretation (*nathan mopheth le'mor,* "he gave a sign, saying," 1 K. 13:3). Sarah laughs about the wondrous words of the three men after concrete reflection (Gen. 18:12f.). Potiphar's wife takes hold of Joseph's garment with specific intention (39:12; cf. Neh. 6:9). The brothers of Joseph are frightened, perplexed (Gen. 42:28). In Egypt, the overseers of the Israelites are beaten by the taskmasters, who justify this treatment by asking the overseers why the Israelites had not made their normal quota of bricks (Ex. 5:13f., *vayyukku . . . le'mor,* "and they were beaten . . . , saying"). In the Sinai account, Yahweh tells Moses to set bounds around the place where he would appear, and to explain to the people what he was doing (19:12). According to Lev. 10:16, Moses was angry, "as he said . . . " ("he was angry *le'mor*"). The spies dishearten the people with their report (Dt. 1:28), and according to the Assyrians Hezekiah misleads his people when he advises them to resist the Assyrians (2 K. 18:32; cf. Isa. 36:15,18; 37:10). The meaning of the trumpet blast is explained after *le'mor* (1 S. 13:3). The men of Anathoth make an attempt on Jeremiah's life, and in connection with this use specific words (Jer. 11:21); and Jeremiah's persecutors lay hold of him and sentence him to death (26:8, *taphas . . . le'mor*).

In a number of cases, the main event follows as a consequence or result of that which is designated by *le'mor*. Although the *le'mor* sentence is placed after the main verb, its contents logically precede the action depicted in the main sentence, e.g., in 1 S. 27:12; 2 K. 7:12; Jer. 36:29. Sarah reflects on her being too old to bear children, and laughs about the announcement of the visitors (Gen. 18:12f.). When the *le'mor* sentence occurs after the event to which it refers, it is always to be translated in the past or the pluperfect. In all the examples mentioned above, *le'mor* could still be rendered by "and (he) said" or "and (he) had said," or "with the words," thus preserving the meaning of *'amar*. This concept experiences a certain abstraction and spiritualization when *le'mor* introduces the content of something that is written after the act of writing (2 S. 11:15; 1 K. 21:9; 2 K. 10:6; Jer. 36:29). Here, what is written speaks, as it were. A

present at an early time in the pledge, in the promise of God (here perhaps proleptically), in the oracle in which the psalmist expresses his belief that God will hear his prayer, and in the divine blessing or curse.[15]

c. *Demand.* In the proclamation of the will of God, in the divine address to man, in the demand of God on man, *ʾamar* is the bearer of the revelation of the law: Ex. 20:1 (Decalog, after *dibber leʾmor*); 20:22 (Book of the Covenant); 34:1,10 (the so-called Yahwistic Decalog); Lev. 17:1 (the Holiness Code, *vayedhabber* with *leʾmor*); Dt. 1:5,6; 5:1 (Deuteronomic Law). *ʾamar* is also bearer of the revelation of the law when the proclamation of the will of God is mediated through human speech, e.g., in Ex. 20:22. Indeed, Deuteronomy is considered to be entirely the speech of Moses. In the course of prophetic speech, too, we encounter the revelation of the will of God (2 S. 7:4f.; Isa. 7:3,4,10). The creative word of God is a command, but *ʾamar* can retain the meaning "to command" in other contexts also, e.g., at the beginning of the Abraham stories (Gen. 12:1), in the flood traditions (6:13; 7:1; 8:15), etc. It can be asked whether the revelation of the law might not also be included in the category of command. To be sure, "to command" often translates the Heb. → צוה *tsivvāh*; especially in Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic literature, the word for law and precept is *mitsvah* (=command). However, *ʾamar,* at least in the form *leʾmor,* is often used along with *tsivvah* in such cases, and several times *ʾamar* by itself means "to command." The functional aspect, uttering a command and making it binding, is carried out in deed by *ʾamar.* The judgment of God, which transcends God's decision to judge (Gen. 6:7, *vayyoʾmer yhvh,* "So the Lord said") in becoming reality through *ʾamar,* "speaking" (2 S. 12:1, mediated through Nathan; cf. Isa. 3:16–4:1; Am. 3:11; etc.), is no different. In this connection, one should not forget that the curse belongs to the category of speaking (Gen. 3:14, 17; 4:10f.; Dt. 27:14). Thus in the OT the "demands of God" (which are made known and carried out) are also and often expressed by *ʾamar.*

d. *Encouragement.* The imputative aspect of the *ʾamar*-event in the theological use of this root is expressed in the strongest way in the encouragement (pledge, promise) of God. The promise to Abraham in Gen. 12:2f. is dependent on *vayyoʾmer yhvh ʾel ʾabhram,* "Now the Lord said to Abram" (12:1; cf. 18:10). The divine decree, which is evoked by a question (→ דרש *dārash,* "inquire of"), is also an *ʾamar*-event and has an imputative character (25:22f.). The same thing is true of the divine blessing in 9:1-7 (*vayyoʾmer lahem,* "and he said to them," comes after *vayebharekh,* "and he [God] blessed"; cf. 1:28; this combination appears with *leʾmor* in 1:22), and of the covenant God gives in 9:8-17. By special divine commission, men impart the divine blessing (Nu. 6:22-26). By pronouncing the benediction, they place (→ שים *śîm*) the divine name on those who are (or are to be) blessed. The contents of the blessing or the covenant or the promise are given in the text after *vayyoʾmer* or *leʾmor* in direct discourse, and

---

15 On the question of ancient Near Eastern parallels and influences, as well as the problem of the word of God, cf. → דבר *dābhār.*

Material chroniony prawem autorskim.

of a *figura etymologica* (etymological figure): Balaam is described as one who has the knowledge of the Most High and sees the vision of the Almighty, and he is also the one who *shomeaʿ ʾimre ʾel,* "hears the words of God." From the analogy of the parallel members, it would be best to interpret *ʾemer* as audible, perceptible, understandable. *kol ʾimre yhvh,* "all the words of Yahweh," in Josh. 24:27 signifies all the words which Joshua spoke to the Israelites at Shechem, and which establish and guarantee the covenant between God and his people and set forth the contents of the covenant together with its duties. Scholars are still debating whether *ʾemer* in Gen. 49:21 is original, but Zobel favors the interpretation "words of the triumphant message."[31] The introduction to the so-called Song of Moses (Dt. 32:1) calls upon heaven and earth to hear that which is expressed in what follows. Here *ʾimre phi,* "the words of my mouth," stands in parallelism with *vaʾadhabberah,* "and I will speak." In any case, both of these expressions have reference to an official announcement. In v. 2, the same phenomenon occurs again with *liqchi,* "my teaching," and *ʾimrathi,* "my speech." It may well be that this passage is fundamental to an understanding of *ʾemer* in the OT outside the Wisdom and Poetic Literature: *ʾemer* means the official announcement. It might also be possible to interpret Jgs. 5:29 in this way.

As an appendix, we may also discuss *maʾamar* here. This noun appears only in the book of Esther, where it always means human "directive," the "expression of the will" to which the person(s) addressed must accommodate himself (1:15; 2:20; 9:32). The two examples from Biblical Aramaic are to be understood basically in the same way (*meʾmar,* Dnl. 4:14[17]; Ezr. 6:9). Here also, one would be correct in translating "rule" or "regulation."

3. *ʾimrah, ʾemrah.* The overwhelming majority of the occurrences of *ʾimrah* in the OT appear in the Psalms. Ps. 119 has a special affinity for this word. *ʾimrah* means purely and simply the word of God in its comprehensive theological sense, as this is developed in Ps. 119. Here *ʾimrah* is not the only term used to describe the word of God, but it stands in parallelism with other words, which help to define it, e.g., with → חק *chōq,* "statute," *mitsvah,* "commandment," *mishpat,* "judgment," *piqqudhim,* "precepts," *ʿedhoth,* "testimonies," *dabhar,* "word," etc. But the definition of *ʾimrah* can also be determined by studying all sorts of activities which God does or intends to do for the worshipper "according to his word." It is in keeping with the whole tenor of Ps. 119 when the legal, the directive function of the "word of God" is emphasized (119:11,67). But the word can also be used in the sense of pledge, promise, protection, support, and comfort (119:38,58,41,76,82,116,170). It gives life (vv. 50,154), and enables a man to walk acceptably with God (vv. 133,158). It is worthwhile to meditate on it and to study it (v. 148); it is a righteous word (*ʾimrath tsidhqekha*) and a word creating justice (vv. 123,172). He who accepts it rejoices in it (v. 162), it is sweet to him (v. 103), he longs for it (v. 82), he can only extol it. But this *ʾimrah* is also pure and tried (v. 140), reliable and true (cf. also Ps. 12:7[6];

---

31 H.-J. Zobel, *Stammesspruch und Geschichte. BZAW,* 95 (1965), 5, 20, 21.

Copyrighted material

mention the ritual *śḥtp śḫm.t*,[5] which means not only "to appease Sekhmet," but also "to break down the anger of Sekhmet."[6] However, here other myths like "the goddess in the strange land" and the Onuris Legend must also be taken into consideration. The appeasement of the raging goddess, who is often localized in Philae, is expressed in the pregnant phrase, "She is angry as Sekhmet, she is gracious as Bastet."[7] Along with the libation, the sistrum played an important role in the appeasement. In a temple scene from Thebes (*Urk.*, VIII, 7c), the king, offering the sistra to the goddess Mut, says: "I take away your anger, I remove your fury, when I appease the rage of your Ka."

The Myth of the Eye of the Sun also presents a special elaboration of the anger motif. The anger of the eye or of the uraeus is directed against the possessor himself.[8] This calls attention to the tension in the character of the Egyptian deity, who is both merciful and raging.

The same ambivalence can be observed in the character of the Pharaoh.[9] According to the teaching of Sehetepibre, the king is "a Bastet who protects the two lands. He who worships him will be one whom his hand defends. He is a Sekhmet against him who transgresses his commandment." The anger or rage of the king falls especially on his enemies in battle. He is "raging like a lion"[10] or "raging like a panther."[11]

Finally, man is threatened by the anger of certain powers in the realm of the dead.[12]

Bergman

2. *Mesopotamia.* The anger of the gods appears occasionally in the Sumerian Hymns as one of several characteristics causing fear ("Who can appease your angry heart?" *SAHG,* 78; "As An had looked angrily at all lands," *ibid.*, 190). It is obvious that no thought was given to the reason for their anger.

In Akkadian, the linguistic expression for "anger" is strikingly quite different from the Hebrew. The two most frequently used words, *agāgu* and *ezēzu* (root *ʿzz,* "to be strong"!), differ from each other in that *agāgu* denotes the momentary excitement, while *ezēzu* indicates an abiding characteristic, but also means "wild, furious," and can be used of natural phenomena.[13] The references to human anger are rather few, and offer little that is of theological interest. The statements concerning the anger of the gods, however, have some significance. First of all, the gods could be angry with each other (Gilg. XI, 171: "Enlil saw the ship and became angry, he was filled with anger against the Igigi gods"; EnEl I, 42: "She was angry and screamed at her husband"; Atraḫasīs III, i, 42f.: "Enki and Enlil

---

5 J. Bergman, *Isis-Seele und Osiris-Ei* (Uppsala, 1970), 16, n. 13.
6 For the antithesis *nšny-ḥtp,* see the examples in *WbÄS,* II, 340.
7 H. Junker, *Der Auszug der Hathor-Tefnut aus Nubien* (Vienna, 1911), 32; *idem, Die Onurislegende* (Vienna, 1917), *passim.*
8 Junker, *Onurislegende,* 132.
9 H. Brunner, *ZÄS,* 79 (1954), 81ff.; 80 (1955), 5ff.
10 *WbÄS,* V, 57, 3 and 8.
11 *WbÄS,* III, 244, 3.
12 J. Zandee, *Death as an Enemy* (Leiden, 1960), 191.
13 *CAD,* IV, 428.

Material com direitos autorais

were angry with each other"). Second, the gods became angry with men, which led them to forsake their cities or lands, or to plan the destruction of the land.[14] Furthermore, it is said in the psalms of lament and the prayers of adjuration that the god or the goddess is angry, and it is asked that he (or she) might be appeased (e.g., *SAHG,* 332, 352f.). Occasionally the sin of man is mentioned as a reason for the anger of the gods.

3. *In West Semitic Languages.* Examples of anger in the West Semitic inscriptions are rare. The statement in the Mesha Inscription, therefore, that the god Chemosh was angry at his land and thus Omri had afflicted Moab for some time,[15] is particularly interesting. Further, a day of anger (*ywm ḥrn*) is mentioned in one of the Sefire treaties,[16] but the context is not clear. In an inscription from Zinjerli it also is said: "Hadad will pour out anger . . . and shall give him nothing to eat in anger" (*vhdd ḥr' lytkh . . . 'l ytn lh l'kl brgz*),[17] and "you shall kill him . . . in anger" (*bḥm'*).[18]

II. Words for "Anger" in the OT.

1. *Etymology.* "Anger" is represented in Hebrew by several words of different origin. a. One root is *'np* with the subst. *'aph,* which sometimes means "nose" and sometimes "anger." The verb stem occurs in Arab. *'anifa,* "to despise, refuse," the noun in Akk. *appu,* Ugar. *'p,* and Arab. *'anfun,* all meaning "nose"; it is doubtful that Ugar. *'p* means "anger."[19] Scholarly opinions differ on the original meaning of the root. Fichtner[20] and *KBL* think the original meaning was "to snort," because both "nose" and "anger" could be derived from this meaning. But Palache argues that there was a development in meaning from "nose" to "anger." Blachère-Chouémi[21] starts with the Arab. root with the original meaning "to be at the head," and derives from this the words for "nose" and "to be haughty"; then from the latter, under the influence of *ʿanafa,* would come the meaning "to despise."

Thus the double meaning of *'aph* as "nose" and "anger" appears evidently only in Hebrew. It is interesting that in the OT the nose plays a certain role in the description of anger: Ezk. 38:18, "my anger will rise up in my nose" (text uncertain); and Ps. 18:8f. (Eng. v. 7f.), "for he was angry; smoke rose up in his nose" (*charah lo ʿalah ʿashan be'appo*). Moreover, there is a clear connection between anger and snorting, e.g., in Ex. 15:8; Ps. 18:16(15); Job 4:9.

The verb *'anaph* appears in the qal and hithpael. The nouns built from this root are *'aph* and *'appayim.*

---

14 For examples, cf. *CAD,* I/1, 139f.; IV, 427f.; cf. Albrektson, *History and the Gods* (Lund, 1967), 91.

15 *KAI,* 181.5.

16 *KAI,* 223 B.12.

17 *KAI,* 214.23.

18 *Ibid.,* 33; speaking of a man.

19 Aistleitner, *WUS.*

20 Fichtner, 392.

21 Blachère-Chouémi, 257ff.

Material com direitos autorais

b. *zaʿam* means "to be angry" and "to curse" in the OT. Neither of these meanings can be shown to be the older. In the Qumran literature this root means only "to curse," and in modern Hebrew only "to be angry," "to be dissatisfied." [22] Gray [23] and *GesB* connect *zaʿam* with the rare Syr. *zaʿem,* "to reproach," but this also could not be derived from the Hebrew. Arab. *zaʿama* means simply "to maintain," while *tazaġġama* can denote angry speaking. [24] Gray finds the key to understanding this word in Nu. 23:7 and Prov. 24:24, where it appears as a synonym of "to curse" (→ ארר *ʾārar* or *qalal*). In this case, originally *zaʿam* was a part of the curse formula, and later it came to denote the emotional condition that lay behind the curse. This helps explain why it is said of Yahweh, "his lips are full of *zaʿam*" (Isa. 30:27). According to Wolff, *zaʿam* means "curse" in Hos. 7:16. [25] Further, it is possible to connect the expressions "day of *zaʿam*" (Ezk. 22:24) and "weapons of *zaʿam*" (Isa. 13:5; Jer. 50:25) with the realization of the curse. *zaʿam* appears in the qal and niphal, and the noun form is *zaʿam.*

c. *zaʿaph* is cognate with Syr. *zaʿeph,* "to address angrily, to be angry," and Arab. *zaʿafa,* "to kill on the spot." Modern Hebrew and Aramaic words derived from this root are used to describe the violence of the rain or of the storm. [26] If we suppose that the original meaning was "to be excited," this would explain the use of *zaʿaph* with reference to natural phenomena (Jonah 1:15, the raging of the sea; Ps. 11:6, *ruach zilʿaphoth,* "whirlwind") and to man (of emotional excitement). *zaʿaph* has this latter sense in Gen. 40:6 and Dnl. 1:10, where it is not necessary to assume another root. [27] The idea in 1 K. 20:43 and 21:4 is "out of humor" (parallel with *sar*). In Prov. 19:3, the LXX translates *zaʿaph* by *aitiátai* ("to accuse"), but it is better to read, "because of Yahweh his heart is excited." In 2 Ch. 26:19 also, "excitement" is the correct translation. *zaʿaph* means "anger" in the other passages where it occurs in the OT (Prov. 19:12; Mic. 7:9; Isa. 30:30; 2 Ch. 16:10; 28:9). It is a natural step from "excitement" to "anger"; perhaps *zaʿam* influenced this development. *zaʿaph* occurs in the qal, and the nouns built from this root are *zaʿaph, zaʿeph,* and *zaʿilʿaphah.*

d. *chemah* is derived from *yacham,* "to be hot" (cf. Arab. *waḥīm,* "hot," *waḥima,* "to lust after"); cf. Aram. *chemaʾ.* [28] According to *GesB,* in five cases it means "venom" (Dt. 32:24; Ps. 58:5[4]–twice; 140:4[3], the venom of a serpent; Job 6:4, poison of arrows). Driver thinks that in some passages it also denotes "fiery wine" (Isa. 27:2-4; Hab. 2:15; Job 36:16-18). [29] It is easy to understand how bodily "heat" is brought about by anger as well as by poison or wine.

---

22 Levy, *WTM;* Jastrow.
23 Gray, *ICC* on Nu. 23:7.
24 *GesB.*
25 H. W. Wolff, *BK in loc.*
26 *GesB.*
27 Against Kopf, *VT,* 9 (1959), 254.
28 *KAI,* 214.33.
29 Driver, *ThZ,* 14 (1958), 131ff.

Material com direitos autorais

zaʿam and *zaʿaph* (once each). *geʿarah,* "rebuke," is used as a synonym of *chemah* in Isa. 51:20 and 66:15. In Ezk. 5:15 and 25:17, *chemah* is connected with chastisement (*tokhechah*), and Ps. 6:2(1) and 38:2(1) speak of "chastening in anger (wrath)."

Since its derivation from *yacham* is clear, it is not surprising that in *chemah,* several times the idea of anger as fire is found (Jer. 4:4; 21:12; Nah. 1:6; Ps. 89:47[46]; Lam. 2:4). The OT also speaks of anger "being kindled" (*yatsath,* 2 K. 22:13,17). On the other hand, *chemah* can also be poured out like water, [35] and the two figures can be combined: "anger is poured out and burns" (Isa. 42:25; Jer. 7:20; 44:6).

e. *charah* appears 92 times as a verb in the OT, either with *ʾaph* as a subject (50 times) or impersonally. The cognate noun *charon* is always used with reference to divine anger (wrath); it occurs 41 times, and 35 of these in connection with *ʾaph*. However, the expression *chari ʾaph* (6 times) can refer to both divine and human anger. When *charon* is used without *ʾaph* (6 times), obviously heat as a psychic phenomenon is attributed to anger in general. In some passages, *charah* means "to be zealous" (Neh. 3:20; Jer. 12:5; 22:15), i.e., one is heated because of zeal.

f. *kʿs* appears as a verb 54 times (43 times of God and 11 times of man), and as a noun 25 times (8 times of God and 17 times of man). This word is characteristic of the Deuteronomistic theology; most of the passages in which it is found are in Deuteronomy, Kings, and Jeremiah. The verb is found usually in the hiphil (in 42 out of 46 occurrences) of the divine wrath brought about by the apostasy of the people. Yahweh is offended when the people prefer idols. Usually the anger denoted by *kaʿas* is not an objective phenomenon; rather, it is an internal feeling. Other words for "anger" are rarely connected with *kaʿas;* sometimes *qanaʾ,* "jealous," appears as a parallel word (Dt. 32:16,21; Ps. 78:58). Sometimes *kaʿas* means "grief," e.g., in Eccl. 7:3 "*kaʿas* is better than laughter"; 1 S. 1:6, "to grieve her"; Ps. 6:8(7); 31:10f.(9f.); Job 17:7.

g. The hithpael of *ʿbr* occurs 8 times with the meaning "to be angry," and in 5 of these cases it refers to God. The noun *ʿebhrah* appears 30 times, and 24 of these refer to God. With the exception of two passages in the Pentateuch (Gen. 49:7; Dt. 3:26), this root is found only in the Later Prophets and the Writings. *ʾaph* (10 times) and *zaʿam* (3 times) are used as synonyms of words built from *ʿbr*. The expression "fire of anger (wrath)" occurs 4 times (Ezk. 21:36[31]; 22:21, 31; 38:19); elsewhere, fire (→ אֵשׁ *ʾēsh*) is connected only with *ʾaph* and *chemah*. The "day of wrath" is mentioned 5 times (Ezk. 7:19; Zeph. 1:15,18; Job 21:30; Prov. 11:4).

h. *qṣp* as a verb is used 16 times of God and 17 of man. But the noun is used almost exclusively of God (it is used of man only in Eccl. 5:16[17] and

---

35 See below, IV.3.

Éléments sous droits d'auteur

Est. 1:18). The verb is almost always used with an object. *ʾaph* (5 times), *chemah* (7 times), *zaʿam* (twice), and *kaʿas* (once) appear as synonyms of words built from the root *qṣp*.

III. Human Anger. On the whole, the OT uses the same expressions to denote human and divine anger, but all together it does not speak of human anger as much as it does of divine anger. Individual men function as the subject of anger. Only in exceptional cases does the OT mention that groups of men are angry. Human anger is usually directed against other men. The reason for human anger can be that someone has been treated unjustly (e.g., Gen. 27:45; 30:2; 39:19; Nu. 24:10), that one sees how other men are exploited (e.g., Gen. 34:7; 2 S. 12:5; 13:21), or that one's fellow men manifest disobedience or unbelief in God (e.g., Ex. 16:20; 32:19; 2 K. 13:19). Although the examples are scarce, there are also some passages in the OT that speak of men becoming angry with God. In this case, the reason is that one views his actions as inexplicable (e.g., Gen. 4:5; 2 S. 6:8; Jonah 4:1,4,9).

In the large majority of cases, the OT censures human anger. Human anger is never clearly approved. But there are instances (esp. in the narrative books) in which the biblical writer does not make a judgment on this. It is simply stated that someone was angry. It follows from Gen. 4:5-7 that human anger is something negative. Furthermore, anger is criticized because it produces negative results (e.g., 49:6f.).

Value judgments of anger appear most frequently in Job, Proverbs, and Ecclesiastes, and they are clearly negative. In these books we find statements like "anger is cruel" (*ʾakhzeriyyuth chemah,* Prov. 27:4), and "strife is pressed out of anger" (30:33). "To still anger" is good, as is clear from 15:1; 21:14. The wise stills anger (29:8,11). The ideal of wisdom is the quiet man who does not err in anger, or as 17:27 puts it, is "a calm and understanding man" (*qar ruach ʾish tebhunah*). Thus, here *qar,* "cool," is used in antithesis to the man who is kindled and heated by anger. The OT censures a man who is hot-tempered (15:18; 29:22). Therefore we also find admonitions not to be angry or not to err in anger (Ps. 37:8; Prov. 16:32; Eccl. 7:9; Job 36:18). Anger characterizes the fool, the irrational, and the evildoer (Prov. 14:17,29; 29:11; Eccl. 7:9; Job 5:2). Job 36:13 speaks of those who are disposed to godlessness (*chanephe lebh,* "the godless of heart"), who cherish anger, and Job 19:29 calls anger sin.

IV. Divine Anger.

1. *Linguistic Analysis.* Words for anger are connected with God three times as often as they are connected with man in the OT. Some words are used almost exclusively with God as subject, e.g., *ʾanaph* and *charon.* The nouns *zaʿam, ʿebhrah,* and *qetseph* predominantly have God as their subject, and in the majority of cases *chemah* and *ʾaph* are used of the divine anger. With few exceptions (*chari ʾaph,* 4 times), combinations of several words for "anger" have to do with the divine wrath exclusively: *charon ʾaph* (33 times), *zaʿaph ʾaph* (Isa. 30:30), *zaʿam ʾaph* (Lam. 2:6), and *ʿebhroth ʾaph* (Job 40:11); so also the following

Éléments sous droits d'auteur

אֲרוֹן ʾarôn

Contents: I. 1. Etymology; 2. Meaning. II. Secular Use. III. Religio-Cultic Use: 1. External Description; 2. Parallels Outside the OT; 3. Origin and Antiquity; 4. Religious Significance; 5. Function; 6. History.

I. 1. *Etymology.* The noun *ʾaron* is a West Semitic word. Besides Biblical Hebrew (where it occurs about 200 times), Christian Palestinian, Syriac, and Arabic (which is derived from the Syriac), it appears in a group of West Semitic inscriptions, and in Late Babylonian as a loanword.[1] In spite of this widespread evidence, its etymology is unknown. The attempts of Meinhold and Morgenstern

---

ʾarôn. W. R. Arnold, *Ephod and Ark* (Cambridge, 1917); A. Bentzen, "The Cultic Use of the Story of the Ark in Samuel," *JBL,* 67 (1948), 37-53; K.-H. Bernhardt, "Lade," *BHHW,* II, 1038-1041; H. A. Brongers, "Einige Aspekte der gegenwärtigen Lage der Lade-Forschung," *NedThT,* 25 (1971), 6-27; C. Brouwer, *De ark* (Baarn, 1955); M. Buber, *Kingship of God* (trans. 1967), 99ff., 186-88; K. Budde, "Die ursprüngliche Bedeutung der Lade Jahwe's," *ZAW,* 21 (1901), 193-97; *idem,* "War die Lade Jahwes ein leerer Thron?" *ThStKr,* 79 (1906), 489-507; *idem,* "Ephod und Lade," *ZAW,* 39 (1921), 1-42; W. Caspari, "Die Bundeslade unter David," *Festschrift Th. Zahn* (1908), 25-46; H. Cazelles, "Israël du nord et arche d'alliance (Jér. III 16)," *VT,* 18 (1968), 147-158; L. Couard, "Die religiös-nationale Bedeutung der Lade Jahves," *ZAW,* 12 (1892), 53-90; G. H. Davies, "The Ark in the Psalms," *Promise and Fulfilment. Essays Presented to S. H. Hooke* (Edinburgh, 1963), 51-61; *idem,* "The Ark of the Covenant," *ASTI,* 5 (1966/67), 30-47; M. Dibelius, *Die Lade Jahves* (1906); L. Dürr, "Ursprung und Bedeutung der Bundeslade," *BZTS,* 1 (1924), 17-32; J. Dus, "Der Brauch der Ladewanderung im alten Israel," *ThZ,* 17 (1961), 1-16; *idem,* "Noch zum Brauch der 'Ladewanderung'," *VT,* 13 (1963), 126-132, 475; *idem,* "Der Beitrag des benjaminitischen Heidentums zur Religion Israels. Zur ältesten Geschichte der heiligen Lade," *ComViat,* 6 (1963), 61-80; *idem,* "Die Länge der Gefangenschaft der Lade im Philisterland," *NedThT,* 18 (1963/64), 440-452; *idem,* "Die Thron- und Bundeslade," *ThZ,* 20 (1964), 241-251; *idem,* "The Dreros Bilingual and the Tabernacle of the Ancient Israelites," *JSS,* 10 (1965), 55-57; *idem,* "Herabfahrung Jahwes auf die Lade und Entziehung der Feuerwolke," *VT,* 19 (1969), 290-311; W. Eichrodt, *Theol OT,* I, 107-115; O. Eissfeldt, "Lade und Stierbild," *ZAW,* 58 (1940/41), 190-215=*KlSchr,* II, 282-305; *idem,* "Jahweh Zebaoth," *Miscellanea Academica Berolinensia,* II, 2 (1950), 128-150, Abb. 1-4=*KlSchr,* III, 103-123, Taf. V 1-4; *idem,* "Silo und Jerusalem," *SVT,* 4 (1957), 138-147=*KlSchr,* III, 417-425; *idem,* "Lade und Gesetzestafeln," *ThZ,* 16 (1960), 281-84=*KlSchr,* III, 526-29; *idem,* "Die Lade Jahwes in Geschichtserzählung, Sage und Lied," *Altertum,* 14 (1968), 131-145; G. Fohrer, *History of Israelite Religion* (trans. 1972), 106-111; T. E. Fretheim, *The Cultic Use of the Ark of the Covenant in the Monarchical Period* (diss., Princeton, 1967), cf. *DissAbs,* 28 (1967/68), 325 A; *idem,* "The Ark in Deuteronomy," *CBQ,* 30 (1968), 1-14; K. Galling, "Kultgerät. 4. Lade," *BRL,* 343f.; M. Görg, *Das Zelt der Begegnung. BBB,* 27 (1967); H. Gressmann, *"Die Lade Jahves und das Allerheiligste des salomonischen Tempels* (1920); H. Gunkel, "Die Lade Jahves ein Thronsitz," *ZMR,* 21 (1906), 33-42; M. Haran, "The Ark and the Cherubim," *Eretz Israel,* 5 (1958), 83-90 (Heb.)=*IEJ,* 9 (1959), 30-38, 89-94 (Eng.); *idem,* "ʿoṭfe, maḥmal and ḳubbe. Notes on the Study of the Origin of Biblical Cult Forms: The Problem of Arabic Parallels," *D. Neiger Memorial Volume* (1959), 215-221; *idem,* "The Disappearance of the Ark," *IEJ,*

[1] *KBL*[3].

(continued on p. 364)

Material com direitos autorais

to postulate an original meaning "box (throne)" or "object similar to a tent," on the basis of alleged archeological parallels, are not convincing, because the texts with one accord speak against these explanations.

2. *Meaning.* In its linguistic usage both in and out of the OT, *'aron* denotes objects used in everyday human life, but in the majority of occurrences in the OT it has to do with an Israelite cult object. Thus, it seems best to begin by attempting to determine the meaning of our word in secular use.

---

13 (1963), 46-58; R. Hartmann, "Zelt und Lade," *ZAW,* 37 (1917/18), 209-244; J. Herrmann, "ἱλαστήριον, 1," *TDNT,* III, 318f.; D. R. Hillers, "Ritual Procession of the Ark and Psalm 132," *CBQ,* 30 (1968), 48-55; W. H. Irwin, "Le sanctuaire central israélite avant l'établissement de la monarchie," *RB,* 72 (1965), 161-184; E. Klamroth, *Lade und Tempel* (n.d. [1932?]); K. Koch, *Die Priesterschrift von Exodus 25 bis Leviticus 16. FRLANT,* 71 (1959); H.-J. Kraus, *Worship in Israel* (trans. 1966), 125-28; W. B. Kristensen, *De ark van Jahwe* (1933); E. Kutsch, "Lade Jahwes," *RGG*^{3}, IV, 197-99; W. Lotz, "Die Bundeslade," *Festschrift der Universität Erlangen,* I (1901), 143-186; H. Lubsczyk, "Die katechetische Verwertung der Überlieferungen von der Bundeslade," *BiLe,* 2 (1961), 206-223; W. McKane, "The Earlier History of the Ark," *TGUOS,* 21 (1965/66), 68-76; J. Maier, *Vom Kultus zur Gnosis. Studien zur Vor- und Frühgeschichte der "jüdischen Gnosis". Bundeslade, Gottesthron und Märkābāh* (Salzburg, 1964); *idem, Das altisraelitische Ladeheiligtum. BZAW,* 93 (1965); H. G. May, "The Ark–a Miniature Temple," *AJSL,* 52 (1935/36), 215-234; J. Meinhold, *Die Lade Jahves* (1900); *idem,* "Die Lade Jahves. Ein Nachtrag," *ThStKr,* 74 (1901), 593-617; J. Morgenstern, "The Ark, the Ephod and the 'Tent of Meeting'," *HUCA,* 17 (1942/43), 153-266; 18 (1943/44), 1-52; E. Nielsen, "Some Reflections on the History of the Ark," *SVT,* 7 (1960), 61-74; M. Noth, *Das System der zwölf Stämme Israels* (1930, ^{2}1966); *idem,* "Jerusalem und die israelitische Tradition," *OTS,* 8 (1950), 28-46=*ThB,* 6, 172-187; Pedersen, *ILC,* III-IV, 229-234; G. von Rad, "Zelt und Lade," *NKZ,* 42 (1931), 478-498=*ThB,* 8 (^{2}1961), 109-129; *idem, OT Theol,* I (trans. 1962), 17-21, 237-39; L. Randellini, "La tenda e l'arca nella tradizione del VT," *Studii Bibl. Franciscani,* L.A. 13 (1962/63), 163-189; W. Reichel, *Über die vorhellenischen Götterkulte* (1897); W. Reimpell, "Der Ursprung der Lade Jahwes," *OLZ,* 19 (1916), 326-331; L. Rost, *Die Überlieferung von der Thronnachfolge Davids. BWANT,* 3/6 (1926), 4-47=*Kleine Credo* (1965), 122-159; *idem,* "Königsherrschaft Jahwes in vorköniglicher Zeit?" *ThLZ,* 85 (1960), 721-24; S. Saba, *L'arca dell'alleanza: Storia, descrizione, significato* (Rome, 1948); H. Schmidt, "Kerubenthron und Lade," *Eucharisterion für H. Gunkel,* I (1923), 120-144; W. H. Schmidt, *Alttestamentlicher Glaube und seine Umwelt* (1968), 105-108; J. Schreiner, *Sion-Jerusalem* (1963), 22-56; Waltraud Seeber, *Der Weg der Tradition von der Lade Jahwes im AT* (diss., Kiel, 1956); cf. *ThLZ,* 83 (1958), 722f.; T. P. Sevensma, *De ark Gods het oud-israëlitische heiligdom* (Amsterdam, 1908); F. Seyring, "Der alttestamentliche Sprachgebrauch inbetreff des Namens der sogen. 'Bundeslade'," *ZAW,* 11 (1891), 114-125; R. Smend, *Yahweh War and Tribal Confederation* (trans. 1970), 76-97; J. A. Soggin, "Zwei umstrittene Stellen aus dem Überlieferungskreis um Schechem," *ZAW,* 73 (1961), 78-87, esp. 78-82; *idem,* "Der offiziell geförderte Synkretismus in Israel während des 10. Jahrhunderts," *ZAW,* 78 (1966), 179-204, esp. 182-88; H. Timm, "Die Ladeerzählung (1. Sam 4-6; 2. Sam 6) und das Kerygma des deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerks," *EvTh,* 26 (1966), 509-526; H. Torczyner, *Bundeslade und Anfänge der Religion Israels* (^{2}1930); *idem* (N. H. Tur-Sinai), "The Ark of God at Beit Shemesh (1 Sam VI) and Pereṣ ʿUzza (2 Sam VI; 1 Chron XIII)," *VT,* 1 (1951), 275-286; de Vaux, *AncIsr,* 297-302; *idem,* "Les chérubins et l'arche d'alliance, les sphinx gardiens et les trônes divins dans l'Ancien Orient," *MUSJ,* 37 (1960/61), 91-124=*Bible et Orient* (Paris, 1967), 231-259; *idem,* "Arche d'alliance et Tente de réunion," *À la rencontre de Dieu. Mém. A. Gelin* (Le Puy, 1961), 55-70=*Bible et Orient* (Paris, 1967), 261-276; A. Weiser, "Die Tempelbaukrise unter David," *ZAW,* 77 (1965), 153-168, esp. 163-65; T. Worden, "The Ark of the Covenant," *Scripture,* 5 (1952), 82-90; M. H. Woudstra, *The Ark of the Covenant from Conquest to Kingship* (Philadelphia, 1965).

Bahan dengan hak cipta

II. Secular Use. In the OT the coffin of Joseph (Gen. 50:26), and the chest furnished by the priest Jehoiada, set up at the entrance of the Jerusalem temple and appointed as the receptacle for the money that was brought (2 K. 12:10,11 [Eng. vv. 9,10]; 2 Ch. 24:8,10,11), are called *ʾaron*. In texts outside the OT, this word is used for a "box," "ossuary," "sarcophagus." [2] It is clear from this that *ʾaron* means a container, chest, ark, etc.

III. Religio-Cultic Use.

1. *External Description.* This meaning obtained from the secular sphere also holds true for the religio-cultic use of the word. For the only description of the cult object called *ʾaron* preserved for us in the OT (Ex. 25:10-22; 37:1-9; cf. Dt. 10:1,3) speaks of an ark of acacia wood, made at the command of Yahweh at Sinai, $2^1/_2$ cubits long, $1^1/_2$ cubits wide, and $1^1/_2$ cubits high, overlaid inside and out with gold. Attached to this ark were rings for poles, which were not supposed to be removed. The testimony (→ עדות *ʿēdhûth*) was placed in this ark; the *kapporeth,* which was $2^1/_2$ cubits long and $1^1/_2$ cubits wide and was made out of gold, and which was adorned with a cherub on each end, but in a technical sense perhaps is to be understood as a "cover plate" rather than a "means or place of atonement," [3] was placed on top of the ark; and the entire structure was put in the "Tent of Meeting" (→ אהל *ʾōhel moʿedh*).

a. This description comes from P, who has taken over various ancient traditions and has combined them with his own theological ideas. As far as the external form is concerned, the cover plate of the ark is an invention of P. *kapporeth* appears only in P, and one gets the impression that the plate is an object to be distinguished from the ark itself, which indicates that originally it was not connected with the ark, but was later connected with the essential cultic function of the ark. [4] With regard to the ornamentation of the *kapporeth,* P borrows from the pattern of the Solomonic temple insofar as the two cherubim which are connected with the temple (1 K. 8:6f.) also appear in his description of the ark. Of course, the cherubim in P are greatly reduced in size, are made from pure gold, and are inseparably connected with the *kapporeth.*

b. It is clear that P has a preference for expensive objects in the sanctuary, and therefore he must have been responsible for the idea that the ark was richly ornamented with gold, although this is not to be taken to mean that originally the ark was not adorned at all. For the view of P, that the gold ornamentation of the ark was made out of pieces of jewelry donated by the Israelites (Ex. 25:1-7; 35:21-29), is in harmony with Ex. 33:3-6 (JE). Twice this passage speaks of the Israelites giving jewelry, and it is correct to infer that this was used in making the ark. Since it is clear here again that P is dependent on earlier traditions (in this

---

[2] *DISO,* 25; *KAI,* 1.1; 11.21; 29.1; etc.
[3] Herrmann, 320; von Rad, "Zelt," 110; Weiser, 310.
[4] Herrmann, 319; de Vaux, *AncIsr,* 300f.; Weiser, 310; cf. H. Schmidt, 137-144.

Bahan dengan hak cipta

case, J and E), one is certainly justified in generalizing and in thinking that the external form of the ark is from earlier traditions. Several scholars correctly assume that P, both in the general outline of his work and in various individual sections (including the narrative on the making of the ark), followed the pattern of R^{JE}, but replaced it with his own description, [5] and perhaps even connected rituals from Israel's monarchical period with it. [6] It follows from this that we should consider the description given by P of the main features of the ark, as a transportable wooden box adorned with precious metal, to be authentic. [7]

c. In a similar way, because of the inferior material, one will also have to deal with the very difficult question of the connection between the ark and the tent. As we have seen, in P they are connected with each other and are said to originate at Sinai. But Deuteronomy speaks only of the ark, and says nothing about the tent (9:7–10:5). However, like P the historical reminiscenses of Deuteronomy are dependent on R^{JE}. Thus, one could reason this way: originally there was a tension between the ark and the tent, which is reflected in the tent's not being mentioned in Deuteronomy; they were connected for the first time by P, who made the tent the dwelling place of the ark in conjunction with the pattern of the Solomonic temple projected back into the wilderness period. [8]

But this is not altogether convincing, because the uniqueness and purpose of Deuteronomy do not sufficiently explain why it does not mention the tent. Von Rad's argument [9] carries more weight. He thinks that the concept of God's dwelling place or throne was attached to the ark, while the idea of *mo'edh*, "meeting (God)," was connected with the tent. Thus the ark emphasized the immanence, and the tent the transcendence, of God who continually revealed himself in Israel's history. This penetrating emphasis on these two ideas is useful in gaining a deeper understanding of the function of these two cult objects. It is doubtful, however, whether we should place such a logical idea of God or such a self-contradictory reality of God [10] at the beginning of the history of the religion of Israel, i.e., whether we should assume that originally there was a connection between the ark and the tent.

2 S. 7:6, where Yahweh says that he had not dwelt in a permanent house from the exodus to the days of David, but in a tent, suggests that the ark and the tent were originally connected. It also supports the validity of the frequently suspected passage, 1 S. 2:22, which states that the women served at the entrance to the tent, thus indicating that in the Shiloh temple, ark and tent were combined. [11] We cannot really exclude altogether the possibility that at one time the *lo* of

---

5 Davies, "Covenant"; Dibelius, 112; Eichrodt, 109f.; Eissfeldt, *KlSchr*, II, 283f., etc.; Schreiner, 24; for a different view Fohrer, 109; Kutsch, 198.

6 Koch, 97.

7 So, among others, Budde, "Ephod," 33f.; Couard, 81; Kraus, 125f.; H. Schmidt, 144; W. H. Schmidt, 108.

8 Kraus, 125f.; cf. de Vaux, *AncIsr*, 297.

9 Von Rad, "Zelt."

10 Eichrodt, 111.

11 Eissfeldt, "Lade Jahwes," 134f.; cf. Woudstra.

Bahan dengan hak cipta

qubba in form and shape that we cannot regard the two as genuinely comparable. [18]

b. Reimpell conjectures that in the framework of thought that existed in the civilized land of Canaan, the ark is to be explained as the "stage of Yahweh," and is to be compared with the holy stages in Petra and among the Hittites; but this view has rightly found no advocates. Gressmann refers to Egyptian shrines for deities and procession barques, and postulates that in form the ark was a double chest containing the images of two deities, viz., the bull and Astarte; but this view also rightly has been rejected. [19]

Finally, referring to pre-Hellenistic divine thrones, Reichel wanted to understand the Israelite ark as an empty throne, thus originating in the civilized land of Canaan; and this view has had several followers. [20] Certainly we encounter the idea of Yahweh's throne in connection with the ark while it was in Shiloh and Jerusalem, and therefore the ark could be understood as a throne of God, similar to thrones of deities which have been demonstrated in other earlier ancient Near Eastern religions. But again, against this is the fact that the ark is not called a "throne," but an *'aron,* a designation which was never abandoned. [21] Thus, this comparison is also useful only to a limited extent. [22]

3. *Origin and Antiquity.* Now as we turn to the question of the origin and antiquity of the ark, which some scholars trace back to Israel's nomadic period and others to the period after Israel's settlement in Canaan, initially we will examine the arguments that seem to oppose the OT tradition and favor the view that the ark did not exist among the Israelites until they came into Canaan. The first argument is based on the evaluation of the tradition of the ark in 2 S. 6. Beginning with Dibelius, [23] the historicity of this chapter came to be suspected, because comparable Pentateuchal narratives are sagas and, like the narratives in Josh. 3–6, are unhistorical. The beginning of the Ark Narrative, to use Rost's terminology, [24] contains "more stories than history." Secondly, 2 S. 6:2 reveals "a sort of renaming" of the ark from an original "ark of God" to "the ark of Yahweh Sebaoth who sits enthroned on the cherubim." [25] The third argument is included in the second, viz., that Israel could not have known of the idea of Yahweh's throne until they settled in Canaan. [26] The conclusion that originally the ark was a Canaanite sanctuary which the Israelites adopted and appropriated to Yahweh seems to be inevitable. [27]

---

18 Recently W. H. Schmidt, 105.

19 Von Rad, *ThB,* 118f.; W. H. Schmidt, 105.

20 Dibelius, Dus, Gunkel, Meinhold, Nielsen, etc.

21 Budde, "Bedeutung der Lade"; Davies, "Covenant"; von Rad, *ThB,* 118.

22 Kutsch, 198.

23 Dibelius, 112ff.

24 Rost, *Kleine Credo,* 122-159.

25 Dibelius, 116; Fohrer, 110f.; von Rad, *ThB,* 120f.

26 Dibelius, 117f.

27 So also Kutsch, 198; Maier, *Ladeheiligtum;* von Rad, *ThB,* 120-29; similarly Fohrer, 110. Gressmann and Arnold incorrectly conclude from the text of 1 S. 14:18, emended according to the LXX, that there were several Canaanite arks.

Material chroniony prawem autorskim

of the role of the ark, Deuteronomy has diminished its significance,[43] which indirectly favors the credibility of the view of the ark reflected in the ancient tradition. The ark was an important symbol of leadership in time of both war and peace.[44]

Beyond this, it seems conceivable that when Deuteronomy speaks of putting the tablets into the ark, it is not inventing something completely new, but is following an earlier tradition, elsewhere unknown to us, that there was something in the ark. This conjecture may be supported by the fact that the name for the ark is *'aron,* which means a box or a container,[45] even if all the attempts to determine the contents of the ark more precisely (a divine image,[46] a covenant treasure,[47] covenant documents,[48] slingstones or meteorites,[49] or [what is most nearly conceivable] holy stones from Sinai[50]) must remain purely hypothetical.[51]

c. Besides this meaning of the ark, the above-mentioned designation of the ark of God as the ark "of Yahweh Sebaoth, who is enthroned on the cherubim" (1 S. 4:4; 2 S. 6:2; similarly 2 K. 19:15 = Isa. 37:16), in connection with passages like Jer. 3:16f. (the ark shall no longer be remembered, but Jerusalem will be called "the throne of Yahweh") and Isa. 66:1; Ps. 99:5; 132:7; Lam. 2:1, which speak of Yahweh's "footstool," perhaps referring to the temple and thus to the ark, and also Nu. 10:35f., have led to the thesis that the ark was understood either exclusively or additionally as the throne of Yahweh.[52] But the Ark Sayings in Nu. 10:35f. cannot be interpreted in this way,[53] and the other passages prove only that there was an idea of a throne of Yahweh in Jerusalem, but not that the ark was such a throne.[54] There are several difficulties with this interpretation. The Hebrew expression does not mean that Yahweh is enthroned "between,"[55] but "upon, over" the cherubim, a statement that (as von Rad has correctly ascertained[56]) "can by no means be connected" with the cherubim of the Solomonic temple: they cover the ark, but do not function as figures supporting a throne. It follows that the Jerusalem ark was not a throne of God, but that Yahweh was worshipped there as the one enthroned on the cherubim. In connection with the above-mentioned passages from Samuel and Ps. 24:7-10,

---

43 Fretheim.

44 Smend, 76ff.; cf. McKane; W. H. Schmidt, 105; Seeber; Soggin, "Stellen," 80ff. Symbol of an anti-Philistine league: Maier, *Ladeheiligtum;* Fohrer, 110.

45 Von Rad, *ThB,* 118.

46 Gressmann; Sevensma.

47 Maier, *Ladeheiligtum.*

48 Irwin; Randellini; Torczyner, 31-38; de Vaux, *AncIsr,* 301; Woudstra.

49 Couard, 75.

50 Most recently Morgenstern, *HUCA,* 17, 154-57; Eissfeldt, "Lade Jahwes," 132.

51 Fohrer, 110; W. H. Schmidt, 108; Schreiner, 24.

52 Among others Dus; Eichrodt; Nielsen; von Rad, *ThB;* Randellini; de Vaux, "Chérubins"; *AncIsr;* Weiser.

53 Among others Buber, 187f.; Rost, "Königsherrschaft," 724.

54 Cf. Haran, "Ark."

55 Gressmann; but contrast Torczyner.

56 Von Rad, *ThB,* 114.

Material chroniony prawem autorskim

that after the ark was made at Sinai, and after the period of the wilderness wandering and the crossing of the Jordan, the places where the ark was kept were located in the tribal territory of Benjamin. At first it was taken to Gilgal near Jericho (Josh. 4:19; cf. 9:6; 10:6). Its transfer from there to or near Bethel (Jgs. 2:1; cf. 20:26ff.) may be connected with the further expansion of the Benjaminite territory, but it can also have been a result of pressure applied by the Moabites when they extended their power even beyond Jericho (Jgs. 3:11-30).

As the period of the judges continued, the ark was brought to the Shiloh temple, which was the first real high point in its history (1 S. 1-3). Since Shiloh was in the territory of Ephraim, its transfer there must surely be traced back to a dispute between Ephraim and Benjamin as to which of these two tribes had the preeminence in the house of Joseph, which is reflected in Jgs. 19–21. We may suppose that Benjamin lost the struggle and the ark to Ephraim.

It is unlikely that the ark had formerly been kept at Shechem (Josh. 8:30-35: a Deuteronomistic revision) and since that time had enjoyed the rank of a central sanctuary, [68] or that the Israelites had a custom of carrying the ark in procession following a regular itinerary. [69]

As a result of the defeat of the Israelites, the ark fell into the hands of the Philistines, who had little delight in it because they experienced the manifestations of Yahweh's power which emanated from the ark, [70] and after seven months [71] they sent it back again into the Israelite territory where it had been before, but which was under their control (1 S. 4:1–7:2). [72] David found it there (Ps. 132:1-9) [73] and transferred it to his new capital (2 S. 6) after he decisively defeated the Philistines and circumscribed their territory (5:17-25). This gave Jerusalem not only a political significance, but also the dignity of a cultic-religious metropolis. [74] Here the ark experienced its second period of glory, which reached its high point and climax when it was brought into the temple of Solomon (1 K. 8).

We are no longer able to determine with certainty whether the ark served as a procession sanctuary during this period and the period that followed, and whether it played a conspicuous role in certain festivals, e.g., the Feast of Tabernacles, [75] or in the great Day of Atonement, [76] even if the meaning of the ark for times of peace suggested above seems to favor these possibilities.

Nothing is known about the later fate and end of the ark. It is possible that it fell into the hands of Pharaoh Shishak (1 K. 14:26). [77] But it could also have

---

[68] Noth, *System,* 95f., 116ff.; Kraus, 127; Schreiner, 25f. To the contrary, Smend and most recently Irwin.

[69] Dus, "Ladewanderung."

[70] Schreiner, 45; Timm.

[71] Dus, "Länge," differs.

[72] Caspari, 7-12; Eissfeldt, *KlSchr,* III, 420; Schreiner, 33.

[73] Cf. Davies, "Psalms."

[74] Eissfeldt, *KlSchr,* III, 417-423; Noth, "Jerusalem."

[75] Fretheim, *Cultic Use;* Seeber; cf. Bentzen and Nielsen.

[76] Eissfeldt, "Lade Jahwes," 141.

[77] Couard, 83.

lion of the steppe" "in his raging power" . . . "for fighting and battle." [48] Again and again the "roaring," "destroying," "fierce," "terror-striking," "fighting" lion is used to characterize the gods Martu, [49] Nanna, [50] Nergal, [51] Ninazu, [52] Ningirsu, [53] Ningizzida, [54] Ninurta, [55] Numushda, [56] Shulgi, [57] Utu, [58] and Zabada. [59]

Lion metaphors, figures, or epithets appear in Akkadian Literature: in a prayer, Irnini is called a "raging lion"; [60] "Irnini, strong, fierce lion, calm your heart." In a hymn, Ishtar, "lioness of Igigi," [61] is addressed in this way: "Thou art a lion that stalks over the meadow." [62] Nergal appears as a "lion, violent with terrifying splendor." [63]

b. Lion metaphors or figures appear for the following kings, among others: Ashurnasirpal says concerning himself, "I am a lion." [64] At the beginning of a battle, Sargon II becomes furious "like a lion," [65] and stalks through the lands of his enemies "like a raging lion which strikes terror." [66] Similar comparisons occur in statements made concerning Sennacherib, [67] Esarhaddon, [68] etc. [69]

Because of its majestic demeanor, the lion is a favorite motif as a decoration on temples and palaces; lions appear on gates as early as the Ur I period; cf. also the lions on gates at Tell Ḫalaf, Arslan Tash, Till Barsip, Mari, etc. [70] Representations of lions on stone slabs or enameled tiles adorn the walls of temples and palaces. [71] The lion appears as a pillar for a throne on a stele of Gudea (for the first time?). [72] Finally, we may mention the battle between the half bull, half man hero and the aggressive lion.

---

48 *Ibid.*, 36.3; cf. also 36.51.
49 *Ibid.*, 36.35, 45, 48.
50 *Ibid.*, 36.12, 19, 54.
51 *Ibid.*, 36.16; 37.6, 7; 39.7.
52 *Ibid.*, 36.18.
53 *Ibid.*, 36.14.
54 *Ibid.*, 39.6.
55 *Ibid.*, 36.4, 26, 50, 53, 60, 61, 63, 64, 65; 39.1; 40.1.
56 *Ibid.*, 36.13.
57 *Ibid.*, 36.9, 11, 15.
58 *Ibid.*, 36.59, 68 (?); 39.9.
59 *Ibid.*, 37.5.
60 E. Ebeling, *Die akkadische Gebetsserie 'Handerhebung'* (1953), 132, line 51.
61 *Ibid.*, line 31.
62 *KB*, V, 12, 118, 14.
63 K 9880, 9=Böllenrücher, *Gebete und Hymnen an Nergal* (1904), 50f.
64 Schott, III, 14a.
65 *Ibid.*, I, 123.
66 *Ibid.*, I, 178.
67 *Ibid.*, I, 123.
68 *Ibid.*, III, 14b.
69 Cf. Seux, 147f.; I. Engnell, *Studies in Divine Kingship* (Uppsala, 1943), 183. On hunting lions, cf. *BuA*, I, 73ff.
70 Van Buren, *Fauna*, 7.
71 *BuA*, 236, 283.
72 Cf. Moortgat, Taf. 188.

Material com direitos autorais

3. *Ancient Syria.* Since the Ugaritic texts make no contribution to the understanding of the lion,[73] we must largely depend on archeological evidence.

a. In the religion of ancient Syria in the second millennium B.C., the fertility goddess Qadshu is represented on a lion naked and wearing a Hathoric wig, and in one hand (or both) she is carrying some snakes. According to Pritchard,[74] the fertility goddess appears many times in Syria from the end of the Middle Bronze to the end of the Late Bronze periods. At Ugarit there was found a representation of a golden appendage with the naked goddess standing on a lion, with two ibexes in her hands.[75] On a three-storied clay house at Beth-Shan (12th century B.C.), two gods are depicted fighting over the possession of Qadshu, who watches above in the window with her animals (a lion and a snake) facing the two fighters.[76] According to Gese,[77] the relationship of Qadshu to the lion calls to mind the association of the Felidae to the mother or fertility goddess in the Neolithic Age (cf. the fertility goddess of Çatal Hüyük with the leopard!).

On a Ugaritic cylinder seal dating between 1450 and 1365 B.C.,[78] there appears a goddess (probably ʿAṯtart) on a lion alongside ʿAnat on a cow. In the pantheon list, ʿAṯtart appears as Ishtar.[79]

The double-lion club appears in the hand of the goddesses Ishtar, ʿAstarte, and ʿAnat,[80] or as a life-size rod on the "earth," worshipped by two men.[81]

b. From the 5th century B.C. on, there appears among the Carthaginians the ʿAstarte-like goddess Tinnit, who is represented on a lion, and was especially widespread in North Africa and in Punic colonization territories. According to Gese,[82] its absence in Syria is probably due to its Libyan origin.

c. From the North Phoenician town of Marathus comes a stele depicting the beardless god Shadrapa standing on a lion, holding in his right hand a kind of club, and holding in his left hand a small lion by the hind legs.[83] Lion reliefs have been found in the sanctuary of Baʿal Shamem on the island of Arwad at Apamea, which perhaps point to a triad:[84] the bull (Baʿal Shamem), the cypress (the local ʿAstarte), and the lion (the young god).

---

[73] Cf. I.5a, 7a.

[74] J. B. Pritchard, *Palestinian Figurines* (1943), 32ff.

[75] C. F. A. Schaeffer, *Ugaritica,* II (1949), 36, Fig. 10.

[76] A. Rowe, *The Four Canaanite Temples of Beth-Shan* (1940), Table 17.2 and 56 Al and 3; also W. F. Albright, *Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan* (1968), 107f.

[77] Gese, 154.

[78] RS 5089=*AO* 17242.

[79] Cf. also B. Hrouda, *RLA,* III, 393.

[80] H. H. von der Osten, *Ancient Oriental Seals in the Collection of Mrs. Agnes Baldwin Brett. OIP,* 37 (1936), No. 93; B. Hrouda, *RLA,* III, 493.

[81] *CANES,* 957.

[82] Gese, 207.

[83] *ANEP,* No. 486.

[84] Gese, 201.

Copyrighted material

4. *Israel's Enemies.* The enemies of Israel, as Egypt, Assyria, and Babylon, are also described in figures of lions. Thus, in the biting irony of Amos, the "rescue" of Israel is "as the shepherd who rescues from the mouth of the lion (*'ari*) two legs, or a piece of an ear" (Am. 3:12). Actually, this "rescue" from the power of the enemy means Israel's downfall, after which only infinitesimally small portions survive. According to Isa. 5:29, the Assyrians (or Tiglath-pileser III) fall on Israel "like a roaring lion (*kephir/labhi'*), which growls, seizes its prey, and carries it off without any being able to rescue (*matstsil*)." According to Jer. 2:14b,15 (v. 16, which alludes to an Egyptian danger, is a later addition),[110] Israel has become the prey of Assyria, and against this prey lions (*kephirim*) roar and roar loudly. Apparently 4:7 means that the Scythians, as a lion (*'aryeh*) and a destroyer of nations, ruin the land and its cities and make them a waste. The *kephir,* "lion," in 25:38 (a later addition?) is an allusion to 4:7. Similarly, in 5:6 the enemy (the Scythians or the Babylonians)[111] is characterized as a lion (*'aryeh*), a wolf, and a leopard, all of which tear in pieces. The figure of the roaring lion (*kephirim*) or the growling lion's whelp (*gore/'arayoth*) also appears in 51:38 (cf. also 50:17).

In an ironic funeral dirge over the downfall of Nineveh (and the Assyrians, Nah. 2:12f.[11f.]; cf. 1:10f.; 2:2-11[1-10]), Nahum (not less drastically than Jeremiah) figuratively characterizes "the political and economic despoiling system of the Assyrian world power, which pitilessly impoverished its subject peoples," as a lion's den (*me'on 'arayoth*) filled with prey.[112] Like lions (*'aryeh, labhi', gur 'aryeh*), the Ninevites plunder and strangle (*taraph*) and fill their dens with prey (*tereph, terephah*). But Yahweh will cut off (by Babylonians and Medes) their prey (*hikhrith tarpekh*), and cause their voice (*qol*) to be heard no more (2:14[13]). Without clearly identifying the enemy concretely, one prophetic lampoon (*mashal*) (Zec. 11:1-3) describes the catastrophes of a world power as like catastrophes that strike cypresses, cedars of Lebanon, oaks of Bashan, and roaring lions (*kephirim*) of the jungle of the Jordan. These figures poetically illustrate the power, pride, and rapacity of the hostile world power.

5. *Individual Persons, Situations, and Maxims.* Finally, the figure of the lion is used of individual persons or situations or maxims. In the book of Proverbs, the king's wrath is compared with the growling of a lion (Prov. 19:12; 20:2); when they become angry, Oriental despots are as dangerous and unpredictable as roaring lions. In a maxim concerning the oppression of the poor in Prov. 28:15, "a wicked ruler (*moshel rasha'*) over a poor people (*'am dal*)" is compared with "a roaring lion (*'ari nohem*) or a charging bear (*dobh shoqeq*)." *rasha'*, "wicked," is apparently illustrated by *shoqeq,* "charging," and *nohem,* "roaring," as especially dangerous and violent.

In the Psalms of Lament, the worshipper characterizes irremedial oppression by his persecutors or enemies by using the figure of lions who lurk in the thicket

---

110 Cf. Rudolph, *HAT,* 12 (³1968), 15.
111 Cf. C. Rietzschel, *Das Problem der Urrolle* (1966).
112 F. Nötscher, *EB,* III, *in loc.;* cf. K. Elliger, *ATD,* XXV (⁶1967), 14f.

Copyrighted material

assumes a special role in that he defends his prey and thus is used to symbolize the protection or care of Yahweh.

The *attacking and hunting lion* is used as a figure for immediate danger: Jer. 4:7; 5:6; 49:19; 50:17; Ps. 7:3(2); cf. 22:22(21); 35:17; 57:5(4); 58:7(6). Closely connected with the figure of the hunting lion is that of the *tearing lion*, which is used to symbolize a threatening, fierce, and destructive power: Am. 3:12; 5:19; Hos. 5:14; (13:7); 13:8; Isa. 38:13; Mic. 5:7(8); Gen. 49:9; Nu. 23:24; 24:9; Dt. 33:22.

Finally, the figure of the *hunted or slain lion* often appears in the OT: Nah. 2:12,14(11,13); Ez. 19:8f.; Job 4:10f.; 10:16.

Botterweck

אֶרֶץ *'erets*

Contents: I. In Ancient Near Eastern Literature: 1. Egyptian; 2. Sumerian-Akkadian; 3. West-Semitic. II. In the OT: 1. Cosmological Sense: Earth; 2. Ground; 3. Underworld; 4. Land; 5. Theological Sense.

I. In Ancient Near Eastern Literature.

1. *Egyptian.* a. The most frequently used Egyptian word for "earth" and "land" is *t3*.[1] The usual hieroglyphic symbol for *t3* has a flat floodland with grains

---

'erets. Y. Aharoni, *The Land of the Bible* (London, ²1968); M. Delcor, "Les attaches littéraires, l'origine et la signification de l'expression biblique 'prendre à témoin le ciel et la terre,'" *VT,* 16 (1966), 8-25; O. Eissfeldt, "Himmel und Erde als Bezeichnungen phönikischer Landschaften," *Ras Schamra und Sanchunjaton* (1939), 107-127=*KlSchr,* II, 227-240; J. Geyer, "קצות הארץ–Hellenistic?" *VT,* 20 (1970), 87-90; J. Harvey, *Le plaidoyer prophétique contre Israël après la rupture de l'alliance* (Bruges, 1967); H. B. Huffmon, "The Covenant Lawsuit in the Prophets," *JBL,* 78 (1959), 285-295; E. Lipiński, *La royauté de Yahwé dans la poesie et le culte de l'ancien Israël* (Brussels, 1965); I. Oppelt, *RAC,* V, 1113-1179; M. Ottosson, *Gilead, Tradition and History* (Lund, 1969); J. G. Plöger, *Literarkritische, formgeschichtliche und stilkritische Untersuchungen zum Deuteronomium. BBB,* 26 (1967); G. von Rad, "Verheissenes Land und Jahwes Land im Hexateuch," *ZDPV,* 66 (1943), 191-204=*ThB,* 8, 87-100; L. Rost, "Bezeichnungen für Land und Volk im AT," *Festschrift O. Procksch* (1934), 125-148=*Das kleine Credo* (1965), 76-101, cited herein; K. Rupprecht, "עלה מן הארץ (Ex 1,10; Hos 2,2); 'sich des Landes bemächtigen'?" *ZAW,* 82 (1970), 442-47; L. I. J. Stadelmann, *The Hebrew Conception of the World. AnBibl,* 39 (1970); R. de Vaux, "Le pays de Canaan," *JAOS,* 88 (1968), 23-30; J. N. M. Wijngaards, *The Dramatization of Salvific History in the Deuteronomic Schools. OTS,* 16 (1969); H. Wildberger, "Israel und sein Land," *EvTh,* 16 (1956), 404-422; G. E. Wright, "The Lawsuit of God," *Israel's Prophetic Heritage. Essays in Honor of J. Muilenburg* (New York, 1962), 26-67.

On I.1.: A. de Buck, *De Egyptische Voorstellingen van den Oerheuvel* (Leiden, 1922); J. J. Clère, "Fragments d'une novelle représentation égyptienne du monde," *Mélanges Maspéro,* I (1934), 30-46; S. Morenz, *Egyptian Religion* (trans. 1973), esp. 29f., 42ff.; H. Schäfer, *Ägyptische und heutige Kunst und Weltgebäude der alten Ägypter* (1928).

[1] *WbÄS,* V, 212-228.

Copyrighted material

On the other hand, *mātu* means "land, territory" as a political entity, but also "the country" in contrast to city or mountains. Both *bēl māti* or *mātāti* and *šar māti* or *mātāti,* "lord" and "king" of the land or of the lands, occur as divine epithets. [25] The king is *šarri mātāti* "the king of (all) lands," [26] which makes clear his claim to world dominion (cf. Shamash as *nūr mātāti,* light of [all] lands). [27]

3. *West Semitic.* Ugar. *'rṣ* means "earth, ground, Underworld." Here also earth stands in antithesis to "heaven" and clouds: Baal raises his voice in the clouds and hurls lightning on the earth. [28] The earth is the sphere of living men: "Hadad will come among the peoples (*ʾmm*), Baal will return to the earth." [29] The substitute king ʿAthtar ʿAriz *ymlk b'rṣ,* "rules over the earth," in connection with which *ʾl klh,* "as god of its entirety," indicates the extent of his rule. *zbl b'l 'rṣ,* "the prince, lord of the earth" as a divine title should also be mentioned here.

There are several cases in which *'rṣ* means "ground," among which the following may be mentioned: *CTA,* 5 [I* AB], VI, 8f., "Baal has fallen to the ground" (*npl l'rṣ*); VI, 27, "Anat searches to the interior of the earth" (*lkbd 'rṣ*); *CTA,* 10 [IV AB], II, 24, "we wish to knock my enemy to the ground"; *CTA,* 16 [II K], III, 5, "rain for the earth" (par. "field"); *CTA,* 5, II, 5, *ybl 'rṣ,* "produce of the earth." There are several instances in which this word means "Underworld," which speak of descending "into the earth," e.g., *CTA,* 5 [I* AB], VI, 25; V, 14f., *wrd bt ḫpṯt 'rṣ/tspr byrdm 'rṣ,* "Go into the depths (cf. *chophshi,* Ps. 88:6 [Eng v. 5]) of the earth below, be numbered among those who descend into the earth."

For our purposes, the West Semitic inscriptions are not very fruitful. In the Mesha Inscription, [30] *'rṣ* occurs three times with the meaning "land" (in line 5, Chemosh is angry with his land, line 29 speaks of "cities which I had annexed to the land," and line 31 refers to the sheep of the land), and once with the more limited meaning "territory" (*'rṣ ʿtrt,* "the territory of Ataroth," line 10).

The following examples from the Phoenician inscriptions should be mentioned: (a) earth: Baal of heaven and El, creator of the earth (*'l qn 'rṣ*); [31] (b) land: "I enlarged the land of the plain of Adana (*'rṣ ʿmq 'dn*); [32] "I subjugated strong lands in the west." [33] The meaning of the expression *ṣdn 'rṣ ym,* "Sidon of the sea land," in *KAI,* 14.16, 18, is debated, but it is probably to be understood as a part of Sidon. [34]

---

25 Tallqvist, *Akk. Götterepitheta,* 48, 245.
26 Seux, 315f.
27 Tallqvist, 133; see further *AHw,* 633f.
28 *CTA,* 4 [II AB], IV-V, 70f.
29 *CTA,* 10 [IV AB], I, 8f.
30 *KAI,* 181.
31 Karatepe, *KAI,* 26 III.18.
32 *KAI,* 26.14f.
33 *KAI,* 26 I.18.
34 Cf. *DISO,* 26 and the literature cited there.

Material com direitos autorais

The following examples may be cited from the Aramaic inscriptions: *KAI,* 216.4, *rb'y 'rq'*, "the four regions of the world"; 266.2, "(Astarte the mistress) of heaven and earth (i.e., of all)"; 214.7, "they cultivate the land and the vineyards" (*y'bdw 'rq vkrm*); Driver, *Aramaic Documents,* 6, 2, *'bwr 'rqt'*, "produce of the earth"; *KAI,* 215.5, 7, *'rq y'dy,* "the land Ya'udi."

II. In the OT. The Heb. *'erets* combines the same nuances of meaning as the related words discussed above: "earth" in the cosmic sense as an antithesis to "heaven," "land" in antithesis to "sea," "ground" and "land" = sovereign territory, the extent of which can be defined more precisely by a genitive, a possessive suffix, or a relative clause; we may add to this other examples where *'erets* means "Underworld," "Hades."

It is not always easy to determine whether *'erets* means "earth" or "land" in a given instance. As an example of this, some passages where the expression *kol ha'arets,* "the whole earth (land)," appears may be discussed here. It would seem to be evident that man was intended to have dominion over the whole *earth* (Gen. 1:26,28). Also, Gen. 7:3 has reference to the animals of the earth, and 8:9 means that the water covered the whole earth. 11:1 means that the whole earth had one language. However, in 13:9,15 *kol ha'arets* means "the whole *land*," and in 41:56 it means Egypt. There is none like Yahweh in all the earth (Ex. 9:14,16); similarly, Ex. 19:5 says, "all the earth is mine"; 9:29 may convey the same idea, but some scholars think the expression here has reference to Egypt. In Dt. 11:25; 19:8; 34:1; Josh. 6:27; 10:40; 11:16,23; 21:43; 1 S. 13:3; and 2 S. 24:8, it means "the whole land," but its meaning is doubtful in Josh. 4:24 ("the peoples of the whole earth," or "of the land"), and in 7:9, "they will cut off our name from the earth (or, out of the land)." Ex. 23:31; Nu. 33:52,55; Josh. 2:24; and 9:24 refer to "the inhabitants of the whole land." In 2 S. 18:8, *kol ha'arets* means the territory east of the Jordan. 1 S. 17:46 is often translated, "that the whole land may know that there is a God in Israel"; but "all the earth" would be a conceivable reading, just as when Naaman says: "Behold, I know that there is no God in all the *earth* but in Israel" (2 K. 5:15). *derekh kol ha'arets,* "(I go) the way of all the earth" (Josh. 23:14; 1 K. 2:2; cf. Gen. 19:31) is an interesting expression.

In Isa. 7:24, clearly the meaning is that "all the *land* will be briers and thorns," and 10:23; 28:22 have reference to "the whole land" (of Israel). In 13:5, it is not clear whether the enemies will destroy the whole earth or the whole land; vv. 9 and 11 seem to favor the view that the reference is to the earth. The meaning "earth" is to be preferred in 6:3; 10:14; 12:5; 14:7,26; 25:8; and 54:5. In Jeremiah *kol ha'arets* usually means "the whole land" (of Israel) (Jer. 4:20,23,27; 8:16; 12:11; 15:10; 23:15; 25:11; 40:4), but it means "earth" in the secondary passages, 50:23 and 51:7. In 45:4, "all flesh" (v. 5) favors the translation "earth."

Joel 1:2,14; 2:1; and Zec. 11:6 speak of "all the inhabitants of the land," while Zeph. 1:18 means "all the inhabitants of the earth." Again, Am. 8:8f. is difficult: does it mean that the land (North Israel) or the whole earth will tremble? The expression *kol ha'arets* has a cosmic dimension in Hab. 2:20; Zeph. 1:18; 3:8,19. According to Zec. 1:10f., the riders patrol the earth and declare that the whole

Material com direitos autorais

earth is at rest; the translation "land" is less likely because of v. 15. But in Zec. 5:3,6, the meaning "the whole land" appears, while 14:9 has a cosmic dimension (cf. v. 8). [35]

1. *Cosmological Sense: Earth.* a. We encounter the bipartite division of the universe especially in texts describing creation or the greatness of the creator God. Yahweh is called "the God of heaven and of the earth" (Gen. 24:3), for he has created heaven and earth (1:1). In the ancient formula of Gen. 14:19,22, El Elyon is called "creator of heaven and earth" (*qoneh shamayim va'arets).* [36] Yahweh has established the ordinances (→ חק *chōq*) of heaven and earth; heaven and earth are his (Ps. 89:12[11]). Heaven is his throne and earth is his footstool (Isa. 66:1; cf. Lam. 2:1), and so he fills the entire creation. From heaven he looks down on the earth (Ps. 102:20[19]).

According to P, heaven was created on the second day (Gen. 1:6-8), and earth on the third (1:9-13). But J says (2:4ff.) nothing about the creation of heaven, but speaks only of the earth, which at first is dry and unfruitful, and is brought to life by water (*'edh*) going up from the earth. The creation of the earth is denoted by different verbs: → ברא *bārā'*, "to create" (Gen. 1:1; 2:4; Isa. 40:28); → עשה *'āśāh,* "to make" (Gen. 2:4; Ex. 20:11; 31:17; 2 K. 19:15; Isa. 37:16; 45:12,18; Jer. 10:12; 27:5; 32:17; 51:15; Ps. 115:15; 121:2; 124:8; 2 Ch. 2:11 [12]; etc.); → יסד *yāsadh,* "to lay the foundations of, found" (Isa. 48:13; 51:13, 16; Zec. 12:1; Ps. 24:2; 78:69; 102:26[25]; 104:5; Job 38:4); *talah,* "to hang" (Job 26:7); *qanah,* "to obtain, create" (Gen. 14:19,22; cf. Ps. 104:24); *raqa',* "to stretch out, spread out" (Isa. 42:5; 44:24; Ps. 136:6); → יצר *yātsar,* "to form, fashion" (Isa. 45:18); *hekhin* (→ כון *kûn*), "to set up, establish" (Ps. 24:2; 119:90; cf. also *takhan,* "its pillars are established," 75:4[3]). None of these verbs is connected with the Primal War motif, but rather with the idea of the creative word of God (33:9). In the strange variant on the creation narrative in Prov. 8:22-31, personified wisdom is the first work of God and rejoices "in his inhabited world" (*bethebhel 'artso*). As Yahweh's creation, the earth is "his earth" (Job 37:13; Prov. 8:31; cf. Ps. 24:1; 89:12[11]; Ex. 9:29; 19:5). He fills heaven and earth (Jer. 23:24), he is the Lord (→ אדון *'adhôn*) of the whole earth (Mic. 4:13; Zec. 6:5; Ps. 97:5), its king (Ps. 47:3,8[2,7]) and God (Isa. 54:5; [37] or is *'erets* here "land"?); he is "the Most High" (→ עליון *'elyôn*) over all the earth (Ps. 83:19[18]; 97:9; 98:4; 100:1). His honor and glory (→ כבוד *kābhôdh*) extend over all the earth (57:6,12[5,11]; Isa. 6:3). In these statements, which for the most part belong to the tradition of God's royal sovereignty, Yahweh appears as the guarantor of world order. This is based on his having set a bound for the waters of chaos (Gen. 1:9; Ps. 104:9; 148:6); thus the earth is established on its pillars in the sea or "upon the rivers" (Ps. 24:2; 104:5; 136:6).

---

35 On the Psalms, see below, II.1.
36 Cf. above, I.3.
37 Cf. the parallels in a tomb inscription, J. Naveh, *IEJ,* 13 (1963), 4-92.

Material com direitos autorais

43:6; 48:20; 49:6; Ps. 61:3[2]; 46:10[9]; Prov. 17:24) or ends (*qetsoth,* Isa. 40:28; 41:5,9; Job 28:24; *qatsve,* Ps. 48:11[10]; 65:6[5]; Isa. 26:15; cf. "from the one end of the earth to the other," Dt. 13:8[7]; 28:64; Jer. 12:12; 25:33; → אפס *'ephes,* Dt. 33:17; 1 S. 2:10; Isa. 45:22; 52:10; Jer. 16:19; Mic. 5:3[4]; Zec. 9:10; Ps. 2:8; 22:28[27]; 72:8; 98:3; Prov. 30:4), sides or remote parts (*yarkethe 'arets,* Jer. 6:22; 25:32; 31:8; 50:41). The earth also has a center or "navel" (*tabbur,* Ezk. 38:12; cf. Jgs. 9:37), which clearly means Jerusalem.[44]

The expanse of the earth is defined very vaguely in the OT: it is called "the great earth" (*'erets rabbah,* Ps. 110:6; cf. Akk. *erṣetu rapaštu*). According to Zec. 14:8f., "all of the earth" over which Yahweh will become king will be bounded by "the eastern sea" (the Persian Gulf) and "the western sea" (the Mediterranean Sea). In Ps. 72:8, the dominion of the king is described as being "from sea to sea, and from the Euphrates to the ends of the earth."

The surface of the earth has been given to man as a dwelling place (Gen. 1:28; Ps. 115:16; Ezk. 41:16; 43:14); the wild beasts (*chayyath ha'arets,* Gen. 1:24) live on it (Isa. 18:6; Jer. 15:3; Ps. 79:2; Prov. 30:24); locusts can cover its face (Ex. 10:5,12,15); plants, herbs, and trees grow out of it (Gen. 1:11f.,29; 7:3; Am. 7:2). The creator gave man the commission to fill the earth and to have dominion over everything that lives on the earth (Gen. 1:28ff.). It is the creator's intention to make the earth a place of blessing. Thus, he causes snow (Job 37:6) and rain (2 S. 14:14; Hos. 6:3; Ps. 72:6; 147:8; Job 5:10; 12:15; 38:26; Eccl. 11:3) to fall on it, and that which grows upon it serves man and beast as food (Gen. 1:29f.; Am. 7:2; Job 28:5; etc.).

In an entirely general sense, men are called "inhabitants of the earth" (*yoshebhe ha'arets,* Isa. 24:5f.,17; Jer. 25:29f.; Zeph. 1:18; Ps. 33:14; 75:4[3]). Other expressions also occur: *goye ha'arets,* "nations of the earth" (Gen. 18:18; 22:18; 26:4; Dt. 28:1; Jer. 26:6; 33:9; 44:8; Zec. 12:3) or *'amme ha'arets,* "peoples of the earth" (Dt. 28:10; Josh. 4:24; 1 K. 8:43,53,60; Ezk. 31:12; Zeph. 3:20; 2 Ch. 6:33; cf. 1 Ch. 5:25; Est. 8:17; Ezr. 10:2,11; Neh. 10:31f. [30f.], "peoples of the land," → גוי *gôy,* → עם *'am*), and *mishpechoth ha'arets,* "families of the earth" (Zec. 14:17). Additional comparable expressions are *mamlekhoth ha'arets,* "the kingdoms of the earth" (Dt. 28:25; 2 K. 19:15; Isa. 37:20; Jer. 25:26), cf. *malkhe ha'arets,* "the kings of the earth" (Ps. 2:2; 89:28 [27]; 102:16[15]; 138:4; 148:11), *kol 'attudhe 'arets,* "all who were leaders of the earth" (Isa. 14:9), and *nikhbadde 'arets,* "the honored of the earth" (23:8f.). The assumption lying behind these expressions is an overall view of the (then known) world as a unity under Yahweh.

In theophany scenes and elsewhere, when Yahweh manifests his power, the earth reacts in submissiveness and fear. It trembles and quakes (1 S. 14:15; Isa. 13:13; 41:5; Jer. 10:10; 49:21; 50:46; 51:29; Joel 2:10; Ps. 18:8[7]; 68:9[8]; 99:1), it staggers and sways like a drunken man (Isa. 24:19f.), it mourns (24:4; 33:9; Jer. 4:28; 12:4; 23:10; Hos. 4:3). When Yahweh comes down upon the earth, the mountains melt and are cleft (Mic. 1:3f.), he speaks to the earth and summons it from the east to the west (Ps. 50:1). "He looks on the earth and it

---

44 Stadelmann, 147-154.

Copyrighted material

expression appears in several variants: Babylon is cut down to the ground (Isa. 14:12; 21:9), and so is Egypt (Ezk. 32:4). "The enemy has crushed my life to the ground" (Ps. 143:3); Yahweh casts the wicked or the proud to the ground (147:6; Ezk. 28:17); the lofty city will be laid low to the ground (Isa. 26:5; par. with *'aphar,* "dust"; cf. Dnl. 8:7,10,12). Edom says proudly: "Who will bring me down to the ground?" (Ob. 3). Amos says: "you cast down righteousness to the ground" (Am. 5:7). Similar expressions are used of the sanctuary (Ps. 74:7), the king's crown (89:40[39]), and the king's throne (89:45[44]).

The mourner sits on the ground (Job 2:13; Lam. 2:21; Ezk. 26:16), as does one who has been deprived of his political power (Isa. 3:26; 47:1; Ob. 3). The OT speaks of persons casting themselves to the ground in reverence (*hishtachavah,* Ex. 34:8; Isa. 49:23; etc.)–before Yahweh (Gen. 24:52; Neh. 8:6), before the king (1 S. 25:23; 1 K. 1:31), or before a prophet (2 K. 2:15; 4:37). [55]

According to Gen. 2:7, man was created of dust (*'aphar*) from the earth (→ אדמה *'adhāmāh*). Thus, man, who was formed out of dust, returns to the earth (Eccl. 12:7; cf. Job 10:9; Gen. 3:19 has *'aphar*). *'aphar* and *'erets* stand in parallelism in Ps. 22:30(29); Isa. 25:12; 26:5; and perhaps 34:7. "Dust of the earth" is also a figure for a multitude and innumerability ("like the dust of the earth," Gen. 28:14; Ex. 8:12f.[16f.]; 2 S. 22:43; cf. "who can measure the dust of the earth?" Isa. 40:12).

3. *Underworld.* The earth is *'erets chayyim,* "the land of the living" (or "of life"), i.e., the earth as the place of human life is contrasted with the Underworld (Isa. 38:11; 53:8; Jer. 11:19; Ezk. 26:20; 32:23-27,32; Ps. 27:13; 52:7[5]; 116:9; 142:6[5]; Job 28:13). In Ecclesiastes, sometimes *'erets* is used pessimistically in the sense of earthly existence: 5:1(2); 7:20; 8:14,16; 11:2f.

Since the Underworld is located in the earth or under the earth, it can be denoted as *'erets tachtith,* "the nether world" (Ezk. 31:14,16,18; 32:18,24), or *tachtiyyoth 'arets,* "the depths of the earth" (Isa. 44:23; Ezk. 26:20; Ps. 63:10 [9]). (Ps. 139:15, "I was woven in the depths of the earth" [*tachtiyyoth 'erets*], betrays a half-forgotten mythological idea of the origin of man in the bosom of Mother Earth.) Expressions like *tehomoth ha'arets* (Ps. 71:20) and *mechqere 'arets,* "the depths of the earth" (Ps. 95:4), also occur.

Occasionally, *'erets* alone (like Akk. *erṣetu*) can mean the Underworld or in any case point to a connection with Sheol, [56] e.g., in Isa. 26:19, "the earth will again bring forth the shadows." At any rate, those who go down into the earth" are the dead (Jonah 2:7[6]; Ps. 22:30[29]; Job 17:16); this expression has a direct parallel in Ugar. *yrdm 'rṣ.* [57]

As the Underworld of the Sumerians and Akkadians is a land from which there is no return, so the Heb. *she'ol,* "Sheol," is a land of gloom and deep darkness, from which one does not return (Job 10:21). It is "a land of forgetfulness" (*'erets neshiyyah,* Ps. 88:13[12]). Since Yahweh is the God of the living,

---

55 *Ibid.*
56 Stadelmann, 128, 167.
57 Dahood, *Mélanges E. Tisserant* (1964), I, 85; Lipiński, 325ff.

the Underworld is not part of his sphere of influence. However, some texts maintain that he is present there too (Ps. 139:8; cf. Jonah 2:3 [2]).

4. *Land.* When *'erets* denotes a circumscribed territory, i.e., when it means "land," it can be defined more concretely in various ways.

a. It can be defined by a genitive indicating the direction: *'erets tsaphon,* "land of the north" (Jer. 3:18; 16:15; 23:8; Zec. 6:6,8), *'erets hanneghebh,* "land of the south" (Gen. 24:62; Nu. 13:29; Jgs. 1:15), *'erets mebho' hashshamesh,* "land of the sunset" (Zec. 8:7), *'erets mizrach,* "land of the sunrise" (8:7), and *'erets qedhem,* "land of the east" (Gen. 25:6).

b. It can be defined by topographical statements, e.g., *'erets hakkikkar,* "land of the circle," i.e., the plain of the Jordan (Gen. 19:28), *'erets ha'emeq,* "the valley region" (Josh. 17:16), *'erets hammishor,* "land of the plain" (Jer. 48:21), and *'erets hakkarmel,* "garden land" (2:7). Perhaps we should also mention here *'erets (hag)gil'adh,* the land east of the Jordan (Transjordan), if *gil'adh* is originally a designation for a natural phenomenon: "rough country." [58]

c. It can be defined by a genitive that puts the land in relationship to a person or a group: *'erets moledheth,* native land (Gen. 11:28; 24:7; 31:13; Jer. 22:10; 46:16; Ezk. 23:15; Ruth 2:11), *'erets 'abhoth,* "land of the fathers" (Gen. 31:3; 48:21), *'erets meghurekha,* "land of your sojournings" (28:4; Ex. 6:4; Ezk. 20:38), *'erets 'achuzzatham,* "land of their possession" (Gen. 36:43; Lev. 14:34; 25:24; Nu. 35:28; Josh. 22:4,9), *'erets yerushshatho,* "land of his possession" (Dt. 2:12; 1 K. 9:19; Jer. 51:28; 2 Ch. 8:6), *'erets shobhehem,* "land of their captivity" (1 K. 8:47; Jer. 30:10; 46:27; Neh. 3:36[4:4]; 2 Ch. 6:37f.), and *'erets 'oyebhehem,* "land of their enemies" (Lev. 26:41,44; cf. 26:34,38; 1 K. 8:48; Jer. 31:16).

d. It can be defined by a genitive of the name of the land or of the people that lives in it, e.g., *'erets mitsrayim,* Egypt, the name for a land used most often in the OT; [59] *'erets kena'an,* Canaan, which was never a kingdom in the political sense, but rather a colonial territory of varying size; [60] *'erets mo'abh,* Moab, *'erets 'edhom,* Edom, both of which were political territories of high rank; [61] *'erets hakkena'ani,* "land of the Canaanites" (Ex. 13:5,11; Dt. 1:7; Josh. 13:4; etc.); *'erets ha'emori,* "land of the Amorite" (always sing.), cf. Akk. *māt amurri* (Am. 2:10; Ex. 3:17; 13:5; Nu. 21:31; Josh. 24:8; Jgs. 10:8; 11:21); *'erets pelishtim,* "land of the Philistines" (Gen. 21:32,34; Ex. 13:17; 1 S. 27:1; 29:11; etc.); *'erets kasdim,* "land of the Chaldeans" (Isa. 23:13; Jer. 24:5; 25:12; etc.); and *'erets bene 'ammon,* "land of the Ammonites" (Dt. 2:19). It is worthy of note

---

58 Ottosson, 15f.
59 Plöger, 100ff.
60 De Vaux; Aharoni, 61ff.
61 Plöger, 115ff.

Copyrighted material

(→ טוב *tôbh*) land" (Ex. 3:8; Nu. 14:7; Dt. 1:25; etc.), an expression that combines "fruitfulness, wealth, beauty–in short, the fulness of blessing"; "it is the abundantly blessed, glorious land." [70] Dt. 8:7-10 speaks hymnically of abundance of water, fruitfulness, plenty of food, and the presence of ore; an aesthetic element appears also in 11:10-12. [71] Further, it is a land flowing with milk and honey (Nu. 13:27; Dt. 6:3; 11:9; 26:9,15; 27:3; Jer. 11:5; 32:22), which could be regarded as gifts from God; and the expression may have a paradisiacal-mythological background. Sometimes the OT speaks also of a "broad land" (*'erets rechabhah*) (Ex. 3:8; Neh. 9:35; cf. *rachabhath yadhayim,* "broad," Jgs. 18:10; Isa. 22:18; 1 Ch. 4:40), which does not denote so much national boundaries, but refers to freedom and prosperity in connection with the "nomadic perspective on life." Expressions like *'erets chemdah,* "land of pleasantness," "precious land" (Jer. 3:19; Ps. 106:24), and *'erets tsebhi,* "the glorious land" (Dnl. 8:9; 11:16,41), also occur.

The promise of the land runs through the patriarchal narratives like a red thread (Gen. 12:7; 13:15,17; 15:18; 17:8; 24:7; 26:3f. [pl. "lands"]; 28:13f.; 35:12; 48:4; 50:24). According to Hoftijzer, the two central passages are 17:1-8, where Abraham is promised numerous descendants who shall receive "all the land of Canaan for an everlasting possession," and chap. 15, where Abraham is promised numerous descendants (v. 5) and the land (v. 7), but not until the fourth generation (v. 16). According to Hoftijzer, the other allusions to these promises are secondary from a traditio-historical point of view. In 12:1, J formulates his own version of the promise: "Go from your country . . . to the land that I will show you, and I will make of you a great nation, and I will bless you . . . , and by you all the families of the earth shall be blessed (or, shall bless themselves, → ברך *bārakh*)." The break with the family of Abraham and with his fatherland, as well as Abraham's acceptance of the promise, are presented very beautifully. The exact meaning of the concluding words is not clear, but they obviously predict that Abraham's obedience will have positive consequences for the whole earth.

According to Alt, the original promise, corresponding to the vital interests of nomads, had to do with descendants, while the land promise was added after the settlement in Canaan. [72] Von Rad thinks that the idea of the conquest did not belong to the ancient cult saga, but went back to the pre-Yahwistic patriarchal religion. The land promise originally had reference to the patriarchal groups and was later transferred to the twelve-tribe league. [73] According to Noth, both the land promise and the promise of descendants were a part of the patriarchal religion. When the patriarchal history was combined with the traditions of the exodus and the conquest, the element of fulfilment in the patriarchal narratives lost its significance and was transferred to the conquest tradition. [74]

---

[70] Plöger, 90.
[71] *Ibid.*, 89.
[72] Alt, *GF.*
[73] G. von Rad, *Formgesch. des Pentateuchs=ThB,* 8, 9, 86; "Verheissenes Land," *ThB,* 8, 87-100.
[74] See also Plöger, 63ff.

Deuteronomy understands the patriarchal narrative exclusively in the sense of land promise. "Possession of the land is a prerequisite for the existence of, and a condition for the continuation of, the people. Loss of the land means the end of the national existence."[75] "The land that Yahweh swore to give to the fathers" is a favorite expression in Deuteronomy (Dt. 1:8,35; 6:10,18,23; 8:1; 10:11; 11:9; 19:8; 26:3; 30:20; 31:7,23; also with *'adhamah*).[76] It emphasizes that Israel possesses the land not because of her own righteousness, but because of the wickedness of its earlier inhabitants and "that he (Yahweh) may confirm the word" (Dt. 9:4ff.). In 4:37f., Yahweh's love to Abraham is specified as the ultimate reason for the possession of the land.

But it is established that the land "is the proper milieu for the fulfilment of the law."[77] Again and again it is emphasized that the people are to learn the law "that they should do it in the land Yahweh is giving them" (Dt. 4:5,14; 5:31; 6:1; 11:31f.). Thus 12:1 says: "These are the statutes and ordinances which you shall be careful to do in the land . . . all the days that you live in the land." Frequently, this formal introduction is used: "When you come into the land Yahweh your God is giving you." The commandment to honor one's parents promises long life in the land[78] for those who keep it–however, *'adhamah* is used here. But in other passages also, obedience and disobedience have consequences for the land. The series of blessings and curses in Dt. 28 pronounce a blessing upon the land (v. 8) and its fruit (v. 11), and a curse upon the fruit of the land (v. 18). Finally, expulsion from the land is mentioned among the results of the curse (v. 63). Similarly, chap. 4 (late?)[79] speaks of utter destruction from the land as a consequence of disobedience (v. 26): "you will not live long upon it, but will be utterly destroyed."[80] But similar ideas also occur in the final chapter of H (Lev. 26). If the people walk in God's statutes, he will "give peace in the land" (v. 6); but if not, the land will not yield its fruit (v. 20), Yahweh will devastate the land (v. 32), the people will go into the lands of their enemies (v. 36), and "the land of your enemies shall eat you up" (v. 38).

Ordinarily, the earlier prophets do not question the possession of the land. But occasionally, we find references to enemy devastation of the land (Isa. 1:7, "your land lies desolate [*shemamah*]"; 6:12, "the forsaken places are many in the midst of the land"; 9:18[19], "through the wrath of Yahweh the land is burned"; Mic. 7:13, "the land will be desolate"). The land is mentioned more often in Jeremiah and Ezekiel. Here a new element is added, viz., the exile from the land "into the lands." Thus, we find statements like these in Jeremiah: Yahweh wanted to give Israel a pleasant land (Jer. 3:19), and if she would improve her conduct, he would allow her to remain in the land (7:7). The people had defiled the land by their sins (2:7), and so, just as they had served foreign gods in their own land, now they would serve strangers in a foreign land (5:19).

---

75 *Ibid.*, 81.
76 *Ibid.*, 63f.; Wijngaards, 77ff.
77 Plöger, 91f.
78 Cf. Wijngaards, 41.
79 Cf. Lohfink, *Höre Israel* (1965), 87ff.
80 Cf. Wijngaards, 41.

เนื้อหาคุ้มครองลิขสิทธิ์

are formuated by their own parents or when they believe that the gods have pronounced them. In view of this, the nouns *arratu* and *māmītu,* "oath, ban," seem to be almost synonymous in the specific ways in which they are used (cf. Šurpu IV, 58 [*arratu*] and V, 42ff. [*mamitu*]). Once they are pronounced and set in force in a given situation, both are efficacious, because they bring about the calamity invoked in the curse. But in spite of the occasional appearance of the attribute *arrat/māmīt lā napšuri,* "an indissoluble curse," both can be counteracted by efficacious incantations which are just as strong or stronger, or by the opposite decision of a deity whom the accursed person petitions. The very abundant incantation literature and the Psalms of Lament have this purpose, among others, in mind.

(f) Sometimes, of course, the noun also denotes the misfortune caused by the curse. In this case, it is said that the *arratu* "lays hold of" someone, "falls upon" him, and "plunges him into terror and fear." Finally, like the Heb. → אלה *'ālāh* [9] and *q[e]lālāh* (→ קלל *qālal*), the noun can be used metonymically for a person who is smitten with misfortune because of a curse; he is a "curse of the gods" (*arrat ilāni*). In spite of numerous curse formulas in which the root *arāru* is used, as far as is known there is no formula in Akkadian that would correspond to the Heb. *'ārûr*-formula.

II. 'rr in Hebrew.

1. *The 'ārûr-Formula in the OT.* Among the various uses of the Heb. root *'rr,* the *'ārûr*-formula, formed with the qal passive participle, occupies a very special position. It is a substantival expression beginning with the predicate *'ārûr* followed by the subject, which can be a pronoun of the 2nd or 3rd person singular or plural, or a person, or a thing. This formula can be expanded by a reason for the curse, or by a more precise explanation of the nature of the curse. The question of whether the mood of the substantival expression was understood as the indicative statement of a curse, or as a wish, must be determined by the context. However, the only passage in which the mood can be assumed with certainty to be a wish is Jer. 20:14f., since the parallel expression in v. 14b says, "let it not be blessed" (*'al yehi bharukh*). In 1 S. 26:19, which Schottroff interprets in this way, [10] in reality we do not find a wish, but a conditional sentence. In all other passages where the *'ārûr*-formula occurs, it is most natural to understand it in the indicative sense.

We must assume that the original *Sitz im Leben* of the expression *'arur 'attah* or *'arurim 'attem,* "Cursed art thou/are they," was the immediate reaction of a person to a suspicious misbehavior on the part of someone else, and that the intention of the one pronouncing this expression was to vigorously keep himself aloof from that person and his action. But the relevant passages in the OT show that the person who was smitten by a curse was in a subordinate relationship to the one who had uttered the curse, and had been expelled from a community

---

[9] Cf. below, IV.
[10] Schottroff, 48.

Materiál chráněný autorskými právy

itative guarantee was considered to be the formula Isaac spoke to the patriarch Jacob, and in Nu. 24:9 it was thought to be the formula that a foreign seer spoke at the direction of Yahweh. According to this formula, those nations who seek friendly relationships with ("bless") Israel are placed under a blessing, but those who are hostile to Israel by means of curse formulas are placed under a curse. In Gen. 12:1-3, J has apparently freely transferred the earlier *barukh-* and *'arur-* formulas to the promise given to Abraham.

If the curse formula was used at one time in order to discourage disrespect for the will of Yahweh found in the Deuteronomic law, then this formula could also be used by the prophets in order to threaten men who doubted Yahweh's power and help (Jer. 17:5; here *ha'ish 'asher* is replaced by *haggebher 'asher,* "the man who"), or who did the work of Yahweh with slackness (48:10, participial form). Mal. 1:4 uses the participial *'arur*-formula to threaten those who offer an inferior sacrifice, and Ps. 119:21 uses it to distinguish between those who are wise in the Torah and insolent rebels. It is clear that this curse formula was intended to defend sacral, social, and national regulations, and therefore could be expressed legitimately only by persons in positions of authority, because it is never in the OT used in private situations against personal enemies. This is the case in spite of the numerous private curses and imprecations in the OT, for these always appear in different, or at least less stereotyped, formulations, and use some form of the root *qll*. The only exception to this is Jer. 20:14f. To be sure, this text has to do with the private life of the prophet; but it makes reference not to a personal enemy or to a concrete event in the prophet's career, but to his birthday and to the anonymous person who brought the news of Jeremiah's birth to his father. Here the curse formula has become an emotional indirect self-imprecation, expressing the prophet's despair.

The use of the curse formula in Gen. 49:7 also falls outside the common usage elsewhere in the OT. Here the curse is directed not against Simeon and Levi, the sons of Jacob, but against their uncontrolled anger. We can see from the way the curse is delineated, however, that actually Simeon and Levi are the ones placed under the curse. Thus, what we have here is an indirect curse in which the author attempts to avoid naming those who are cursed.

Sometimes the delineation of the curse following the curse formula describes more precisely the misfortune that the catastrophe brought about by the curse produces: lack of success in agricultural pursuits and restlessness (Gen. 4:12), dispersion and destruction of the tribe (49:7), loss of children (Josh. 6:26), reduction to slavery (9:23; Gen. 9:25), frustration and unhappiness in every respect (Jer. 17:5). Dt. 28:15-19 contains the most detailed delineation of the curse in the following verses down to v. 68. Here the misfortune (brought about by the curse) that will fall on the whole people if they break the covenant is depicted in the most gruesome colors.

Thus the *'arur*-formula is the most powerful "decree" expressed by an authority, and by means of it a man or a group that has committed a serious transgression against the community or against a legitimate authority (God, parents) is delivered over to misfortune. Moreover, originally it was probably thought that the word became effective in and of itself the moment the conditions for the

Materiál chránený autorskými právy

activation of the curse were present. And yet, the expansion of the *'arur*-formula to *'arur liphne yhvh,* "Cursed before Yahweh" (Josh. 6:26; 1 S. 26:19), which already occurs in ancient texts, justifies the conjecture that the activation of misfortune was closely connected with an intervention of Yahweh. This conjecture is strengthened by the delineation of the curse in Dt. 28, [13] by the many amorphous curses in the OT in which Yahweh is invoked explicitly or is named as the one working misfortune, and by the antithetical formula "*barukh* so-and-so *leyhvh,*" "Blessed is so-and-so for Yahweh," or "May so-and-so be blessed for Yahweh" (→ ברך *bārakh*). [14] Therefore, one must be careful about adopting a purely magical understanding of the curse formula. [15]

2. *Other Forms of the Root 'rr in the OT.* The qal passive participle is used elsewhere in the OT only with reference to Jezebel, whom Jehu calls "this cursed woman" (2 K. 9:34). One subject of the other forms of *'rr* in the qal is God, who in the 1st person (*'a'or,* "I will curse," Gen. 12:3; *'arothi,* "I will curse," Mal. 2:2) "curses" those who refuse the blessing of Abraham, or changes the blessings of priests who perform their service unconscientiously into a curse. Another subject is the seer Balaam (Nu. 22:6,12; 23:7); and a third, the army of the tribes which was called up to "curse" (*'oru*) those who had not participated in the war of Yahweh (Jgs. 5:23). Apparently, a fourth subject is specific persons who allegedly have the power to pronounce powerful curses, and whom, therefore, different people ask to curse their enemies, as Balak king of Moab asked Balaam. Thus Job calls on "those who curse the day" (*'orere yom,* Job 3:8), and we are compelled to understand the "ones who curse" (*'orerekha*) Jacob-Israel in Gen. 27:29 and Nu. 24:9 as professional "cursers" of the same sort as Balaam, whom enemy nations call upon to render Israel harmless before them. But Yahweh rescinds their curse, and puts them under a curse. In Gen. 12:3, the Yahwist has undoubtedly enlarged the circle of people who wanted to "curse" Israel or its patriarch Abraham, and thus refers to all persons or nations who despise and curse Israel; therefore, here he has used the piel active participle of *qll* [16] (→ קלל *qālal*) instead of the qal active participle of *'rr*. It may also be that Ex. 22:27(28) is not to be interpreted as a prohibition of all "private" imprecations or amorphous "curses" against a tribal prince or a king, but of a formal curse pronounced by this sort of professional "curser," especially since *'rr* is never used in other passages to denote imprecations or curses pronounced by subjects against persons in positions of authority or against God; *qillel* is always used to convey this idea.

No significant difference between the niphal (Mal. 3:9, pl. ptcp.) and the hophal (Num. 22:6, 3rd person sing.) can be ascertained; both mean something like "to be smitten by a curse." At the same time, Nu. 22:6 testifies to the belief that one who has been cursed by a man like Balaam is certain to fall under the misfortune

---

13 Cf. Plöger.
14 Cf. Schottroff, 167-69.
15 Cf. Brichto, 205-215.
16 Cf. below, III.2.

Material com direitos autorais

also developed a rich store of forms, and numerous figures and expressions, from which curses could be formulated for all situations.

IV. The Religious Significance of the Curse.

1. *In the Ancient Near East.* That the curse, as a forceful word producing destructive powers, is connected with the magical view of life of ancient cultures, is undisputed. But it is clear that in the high cultures of the ancient Near East the magical element is covered over by religious ideas, although it is not completely suppressed. A curse is considered to be unlawful as a magical spell for producing destruction, i.e., as a private means of revenge to smite a personal enemy, or as a means of gaining personal advantage by getting rid of other people, and therefore is prohibited by law.[32] By way of contrast, a lawful curse is connected very closely with the deity, whether it take the form of a wish that the deity would "curse" the evildoer himself, or of a curse formula in which the deity somehow is mentioned by name, or curse formulas connected with religious rites or deposited at a sanctuary on written records ratified by a curse.[33] To be sure, the plentiful ancient Near Eastern "incantation literature" also shows us that it was difficult to draw the line between religion and magic. The very fervent prayers to the gods to annul a curse or to curse unrighteous enemies, which sometimes appear in the incantation texts, are so intimately connected with abstruse symbolic acts which sometimes are reflected in ritual instructions, that it is impossible to avoid the impression that people in the ancient Near East actually believed that the gods could be forced by such formulas and acts to intervene in the manner desired. In contrast to this magical interpretation is the equally well-attested belief that the gods could render an unrighteous curse ineffective or prevent it from becoming effective, that a person could even render a legal curse inoperative by confessing his sins and praying to the deity for forgiveness, and that in the final analysis the deity was free to work good or evil.

The *Sitz im Leben* of the legal curse may be the sacral, the public-legal, or the private sphere. In private everyday life, its main purpose is to prevent unjust harm; thus, a person curses his enemy whom he cannot prosecute, or discourages would-be thieves, dishonest people who discover lost possessions, violators of the family tomb, etc., by proclaiming or writing down a curse formula. Both the civil law and the public and sacral law use the curse in order to guarantee the truth of an oath or of a testimony, the observance of a contract or treaty, and the safety of records and public or sacral monuments and buildings, as well as entire legal corpora and religious institutions. Indeed, both for the individual and for the community, the curse is often the only or last legal method of effectively discouraging violators of the law and evildoers, or of finding out what is true. The curse was able to accomplish this task because people were convinced of its effectiveness.[34] Together with blessing formulas, curses played a signif-

---

[32] Cf. the examples in Schottroff, 17, n. 2.

[33] Egyptian examples of both kinds are given in *RÄR*, 195.

[34] See the examples given in the works of the scholars mentioned above under III.1, and also in V. Korošec, *Keilschriftrecht, HO* I, suppl. vol. III (Leiden, 1964), 49-219.

Copyrighted material

icant role in the ratification of treaties. In this setting, more or less extensive series of curses, formulated in a wide variety of ways, were placed after the enumeration of the conditions of the treaty. They pronounced misfortune upon would-be violators of the treaty. When the ritual of making the treaty took place, and, among the Hittites, when high governmental officials and military officers were sworn into office, such curses were accompanied by symbolic acts which effectively emphasized the curses (cutting off the head of an animal, pouring out blood or water, or sprinkling salt). [35]

2. *In Israel.* From this background, we get an insight into the variety of ideas concerning the curse reflected in the OT. We detect a *Sitz im Leben* in the private sphere in texts like Jgs. 17:1-3; [36] Jer. 17:12-18; 18:18-23; Ps. 58; 59:13f. (12f.); 69:21-29(20-28); and 109. Here a woman endangered by a thief, one who is unjustly persecuted, and a person threatened by a malicious sorcerer, see no other way to protect themselves than to pronounce a curse, but all of these appear in the form of prayers that Yahweh would intervene. The Israelite law also prohibits the use of malicious sorcery upon penalty of death (Ex. 22:17 [18]). As the study of *'alah* and of the *'arur*-formula has shown, the curse found its way into Israelite law very early as a part of the oath, and as a guarantee of treaty agreements, authoritative ordinances and statutes, and public and sacral institutions. Moreover, Jer. 34:18 shows that the curse also could be replaced by or accompanied by symbolic acts, pointing to the death of violators of the treaty. When Israel adopted the idea of a treaty or of a unilateral legal union of God with his people, which is without analogy elsewhere in the ancient Near East, she went so far as to transfer the form of the symbolically expressed conditional oath-curse to Yahweh (Gen. 15:17f.; [37] so also, in the sprinkling of the blood not only on the people but also on the altar, in Ex. 24:6, the altar is probably intended as a representation of Yahweh). In the cult tradition found in D and H, the whole ethico-religious system, which now was considered to be the Yahweh covenant, was also secured by long ratifications of curses and blessings (Dt. 27f.; Lev. 26), analogous to the ancient Near Eastern treaty texts. It was probably under the influence of this cult tradition that the people also adopted many forms of the curse saying in their proclamation of calamity. [38]

Even though rituals like that found in Nu. 5:11-30 strongly suggest magical practices, the curse has a stronger religious emphasis in the OT than it does in the ancient Near Eastern literature. This is the case because in the OT the curse is a means of seeing to it that the will of God, divine judgment, and divine acts of vengeance proclaimed in the judicial system, in ethics, and in religion are executed. Viewed in this light, the so-called Imprecatory Psalms and other

---

35 See the examples in Scharbert, 37-44; D. J. McCarthy, *Treaty and Covenant* (Rome, 1963); V. Korošec, *Hethit. Staatsverträge* (1931); the most detailed ratifications by curse are found in the text published by D. J. Wiseman, *The Vassal-Treaties of Esarhaddon* (London, 1958), lines 397-668.

36 Cf. → אלה *'ālāh* II.1.

37 Cf. N. Lohfink, *Die Landverheissung als Eid. SBS,* 28 (1967).

38 Cf. Hillers, Fensham, Müller, and Schächter.

Copyrighted material

in it as a determinative. Several of the words for "flame," etc. (esp. *nśr.t* and *nby.t*), are also designations for goddesses like Sachmet, who is depicted in the form of a lion, perhaps suggesting the idea of her fiery nature. Apparently, this is also related to their connection with the Royal Serpent/Royal Crown, which was often called "The Fiery One."

The ambivalent nature of fire is clearly evident especially in the cult and in all sorts of magical customs. On the one hand, fire has a purifying effect and represents an effective protection against evil powers; on the other hand it is the element of destruction and thus a dangerous power.

b. We hear little about fire as a part of the cosmos. Series of elements like "wind, light, water, and fire" (by the effect of which everything lives) are rare and late (perhaps under Greek influence).

In the cosmogonic views, fire is connected especially with the sun. In the Hermopolitan Cosmogony, "the Flaming Island" [2] is the birthplace of Re. Apparently, the "Fiery Lake," which is mentioned in chap. 17 of the Book of the Dead, is a Herakleopolitan parallel to this. This text often speaks of the "fiery sunny eye," which destroys the enemy of Re with its flame. As the sun and Re could simply be said to be a "flame," so we hear that Amun was "the torch of life which came forth out of the Primal Sea and gives light to mankind" (*Urk.*, IV, 111, 11). Similarly, Khnum in Esna is "the one who comes forth out of the Primal Sea and looks like a flame" (Text 378, 10).

c. The chaotic powers could also be described as flames. Pyr. 237 speaks of a hostile flame which comes forth out of the Primal Sea. In a coffin text, [3] Apophis is called "flame." According to the little developed eschatological views, one day the world will be threatened by a flame. [4]

d. In the Egyptian temple cult, fire performed several important functions. Thus, on the day of its consecration, a temple was supposed to be purified with torches. [5] In the daily cult, a flame was kindled at the entrance into the Most Holy Place. [6] In the burnt offering, the ambivalence of the burning is particularly clear. For one thing, the sacrificial animals represent the enemies of the god which had to be burned and destroyed; yet the burnt offering is considered to be a roast offering whose smell pleased the god.

Fire also plays a role in the tomb cult, which naturally was connected with the ceremonies of the Osiris tombs. After the ritual of the hourly watch, [7] lamps were lighted on the bier of Osiris at the breaking of dusk. Frequently, the protective function of these lamps or torches is emphasized (e.g., in the Book of the Dead 137). In this connection, reference is made alternately to the "torch in the

---

2 See *RÄR*, 194.
3 De Buck, *CT*, V, 244d.
4 PSalt 825.17, 19ff.; Schott, *AnBibl*, 12 (1959), 327.
5 R. Lepsius, *Denkmäler aus Ägypten und Äthiopien* (1849ff.), III, 84.
6 A. Moret, *Rituel du culte divin journalier* (1902), 9ff.
7 H. Junker, *Die Stundenwachen in den Osirismysterien* (1910), 65.

Copyrighted material

night" and to the Eye of Horus (cf. *Urk.*, IV, 117, 2; 148, 13). This combination is of greatest importance, for it made it possible for goddesses who were regarded as the Eye of Horus to assume the role of flame goddesses. Thus, among the transformations that the dead person wishes to experience are "the change into a flame," [8] and "the change into the glowing Eye of Horus": [9] as Eye of Horus and flame, he is able to defeat his enemies.

e. On the other hand, fiery streams, fiery lakes, and all sorts of fire-breathing demons appear among the perils of the Underworld. It is clear from the imposing collection of material made by Zandee [10] that punishment and destruction played a great role in that terror-filled world.

f. As far as the figurative use of "fire," "flame," etc., is concerned, [11] the Egyptians liked to speak of flames and fire, e.g., in connection with poisons and diseases. And the same is true of expressions for wrath and violence ("the fire of speech," etc.). In the royal ideology, "the fire in its time" is a term that denotes the fighting Pharaoh; he is comparable to a "fire which can reduce its aggressor to ashes."

Bergman

2. *Mesopotamia.* In daily life, fire (Sum. *izi*, Akk. *išātu* or *girru*) played the role it had had from of old: fragments discovered by archeologists, in written sources dating from a half to a whole millennium later, indicate that from the third millennium B.C. artificial fire was used to produce light and heat (and heat was used to prepare food, to manufacture glass, etc., and to bake clay tablets and sun-dried bricks). Thorns and cane especially, and rarely charcoal, were used as fuel to produce heat. [12]

Mention should be made in particular of fire as it was used in cultic acts, although we are not able to specify more precisely the "purposes" of fire in such acts: cf. the Sumerian name for a month, *gu$_4$-rá-izi-mú-a-^{d}nanše*, "(Festival) of the goddess Nanshe, in which a (torch-)fire is kindled for the bull (to be sacrificed?)," which appears from approximately 2500 B.C. on. [13] In a ritual instruction concerning an exorcism from the 7th century B.C., we read, "with a sulphur fire you (=the priest) set fire to a torch, and then you set the wood-pile on fire (with it)." [14] In another ritual instruction from the same period we read, "You make a pile of poplar shavings, set it on fire, and sprinkle ... (=aromatic substances for a smoke offering) into it." [15]

---

[8] De Buck, *CT*, I, 250c-d.
[9] *Ibid.*, VI, 98ff.
[10] J. Zandee, *Death as an Enemy* (1960), 133-146.
[11] See H. Grapow, *Die bildlichen Ausdrücke des Ägyptischen* (1924), 47, 166.
[12] Cf. A. Salonen, *Die Hausgeräte der Alten Mesopotamier*, I (1965), 130ff. ("Beleuchtungsgeräte"); *idem*, "Die Öfen der Alten Mesopotamier," *Baghdader Mitteilungen*, 3 (1964), 100ff.
[13] Cf. the examples in B. Landsberger, "Der kultische Kalender," *LSS*, 6, 1-2,46.
[14] E. Ebeling, *ArOr*, 17/1 (1949), 187-89.17.
[15] Ebeling, *Die akkadische Gebetsserie 'Handerhebung'* (1953), 136, lines 108f.

Copyrighted material

We find this statement in a commentary on cultic procedures presumably of the New Year Festival: "the fire which is kindled before the goddess Ninhil, the sheep which they lay 'on the oven,' which the fire burns: this is Kingu, as he is burned in the fire." [16] According to the Babylonian song of creation, Enuma Elish, after the defeat of Marduk the god Kingu is slain and men are created from his flesh.

Apart from the realm of the destructive power of fire, fire signals (Akk. *išātum*, lit. simply "fire") in particular should be mentioned. They were used to convey messages, as we know especially from the Mari texts (early second millennium B.C., in the region around the central Euphrates). [17]

It is probably only accidental that there few references are made to signs of ownership on animals in the form of brands; cf. the statement from the Middle Babylonian period (*ca.* 1310 B.C.), "one ... cow which has no brand (lit. fire sign, Akk. *šimat išātim*)." [18]

With regard to the destructive power of fire, we hear of its use in this way in the earliest group of historical Sumerian texts; cf. the frequent repetition of the statement, "the man of Umma (=the hostile king) has set the ... sanctuary on fire (Sum. *izi ba-SUM*)," in an inscription of the city prince Urukagina of Lagash (*ca.* 2355 B.C.). [19] From a later period, we may compare the statement by the Assyrian king Shalmaneser I (1274-1245 B.C.), "the remainder of his (=the enemy's) cities I burned down with fire" (Akk. *ina išāti lûqelli*). [20] Quite similar expressions are numerous in the accounts of the wars of Assyrian kings down to Ashurbanipal (669-631 [?] B.C.) (Akk. *ina išāti ašrup* or *ina girri aqmu*). For reflections of such expressions in literary texts, we may compare this epithet of the god Nusku from a Sumerian hymn, "he who casts fire on the enemy" (*erím-e izi sum-mu*). [21] In a collection of omina, on the basis of observing animal intestines (hepatoscopy) this proclamation is given: "(under such and such conditions) you shall set fire to the hut of (your) enemy (*išātu tanaddi*)." [22]

Finally, §25 in the penal code of the Code of Hammurabi should be mentioned here. It declares: "(he who comes to extinguish a fire in someone else's house, but then steals something from that house:) this man shall be cast into that fire (*ana išātim šuāti innaddi*)." [23]

Destruction by fire also plays a role in magic. Thus, according to the incantation ritual called Maqlû ("burning"), often images of the sorceress or sorceresses by whom someone thinks he is being persecuted are made out of wood or wax, and then during the recitation of the incantations are burned with fire. These incantations are directed to the image of the sorceresses or of the sorceress,

---

16 CT 15, 44, 8ff.=H. Zimmern, "Zum babylonischen Neujahrsfest," *BSGW*, 58, 131, 8ff.
17 See G. Dossin, *RA*, 35 (1938), 174ff.
18 *PBS*, 2/2, No. 27, 1.
19 F. Thureau-Dangin, *SAK*.
20 E. Ebeling, *et al.*, *Die Inschriften der altassyrischen Könige*, 118f., 3, 7.
21 J. van Dijk, *Sumerische Götterlieder*, II (1960), 109 and 112, 1. IV 5.
22 F. Thureau-Dangin, *TCL*, 6, Nos. 4, 13; copy from the Seleucid Period.
23 For further literature, cf. M. San Nicolò, *RLA*, III, 59.

Материјал заштићен ауторским правима

creation [35] says of Marduk, after he was created, "when he moved his lips, a fire was kindled" (I, 96). Furthermore, in the Gilgamesh Epic, the friend and servant of the hero describes the giant Ḫumbaba in this way: "his roar is a flood; yea, his mouth is fire; his breath, death." [36] And the Assyrian king Ashurbanipal says in a song of praise to the goddesses of Nineveh and Arbela: "the word of their lips is a kindled fire *(girru napḫu)*." [37]

The incantations frequently speak of the raging of demons "with fire" or "as (with) fire": "the Asakku-demon (a disease) . . . lights a fire in the depth (of the Primal Ocean) and cooks the fish there"; [38] "the evil Namtar-demon that burns the land as (with) fire." [39]

By the fire not kindled by men or gods, the Babylonians clearly had in mind the fire (perhaps ignited by a flash of lightning) in the dry reeds and in the grassy steppe. In any case, the comparison with the reed and grass fire that blazes high but soon goes out frequently occurs; cf. the statement from a Sumerian incantation (*ca.* 1800 B.C.), "then his (=the man's) Asakku-illness will terminate of its own accord as a reed-grass fire that (swiftly) goes out." [40] For lightning (Sum. *nim-gír;* Akk. *birqu,* also *miqit išāti* [fire falling]) as a natural cause of fire, cf. *CAD* under *išātu* 1 a l', and from the Sumerian Lugalbanda Epic, the prayer of Lugalbanda that the Anzu-bird might make it his lot to be able "to rise up like a flame" and "to flash (down) like lightning." [41]

Krecher

II. Philological Considerations. According to *KBL*[3], 89, *'esh* occurs 380 times in the OT. It is found in all Semitic languages except Arabic. We are to understand that in Hebrew the second radical was reduplicated (probably at a later time). [42] The gender is feminine. [43] The pl. *'eshoth* appears only in Sir. 48:3. The substantive lacks a verbal cognate in the OT.

III. Earthly Fire.

1. *In Everyday Life and in Similes.* The importance of fire as dispenser of heat and light in daily life is obvious; see the enumeration in Sir. 39:26. The practice of starting a fire by striking flint, which was well known throughout the world, is mentioned in 2 Macc. 10:3. Because of the exertion of energy connected with this practice, starting a fire on the Sabbath day was forbidden (Ex. 35:3). Of course, the devastating power of insatiable fire was familiar (Prov. 30:16). Those guilty of starting fires that caused damage were punished (Ex.

---

35 See above.
36 A. Schott-W. von Soden, *Das Gilgamesch-Epos* (1958), pp. 34, 110.
37 S. Langdon, *Babylonian Penitential Psalms. OECT,* 6 (1927), 68, 6.
38 R. Borger, *JCS,* 21 (1967), 7 and 14, line 66.
39 CT 17, 29, 1f.
40 A. Falkenstein, *Die Haupttypen der sumerischen Beschwörung. LSS,* N.F. 1 (1931), 63 with n. 2; further W. Römer, *lišān mitḫurti, AOT,* 1, 285f., 42.
41 C. Wilcke, *Das Lugalbandaepos* (diss., Heidelberg, 1969), 108f., 173.
42 *BLe,* 454.
43 *ZAW,* 16 (1896), 63.

Copyrighted material

lightning (as fire from heaven) is sent out as an arrow by God himself (Ps. 18:15 [14]; 29:7; 144:6; etc.). These poetic passages in the Psalms have in mind a kind of theophany, in which Yahweh rides on the storm-clouds.[45] "He makes fire and flame his ministers" in Ps. 104:4 means "He makes lightning flashes his ministers" (cf. 148:8: fire and hail). God sends thunder, lightning, and hail as plagues (Ex. 9:23). "Fire of God" falls from heaven: Job 1:16; 1 K. 18:38; 2 K. 1:10,12; 2 Ch. 7:1; Sir. 48:3. Related to, but not quite identical with the lightning is the idea that God expressly (usually to punish, but in Jgs. 6:21; Lev. 9:24; 1 K. 18:38; 2 Ch. 7:1 to consume the sacrifice) sends fire (Nu. 11:1-3; 16:35; Lev. 10:2; Lam. 1:13). The concept of the Holy War probably lies behind this idea, particularly in the formal transitional verse, "I will send a fire upon . . . , and it shall devour his palaces" (Am. 1:4,7,10,12,14; 2:2,5; Jer. 17:27; 49:27; Hos. 8:14). According to Gen. 19:24, Yahweh rains brimstone and fire on Sodom and Gomorrah (so similarly Ezk. 38:22; 39:6; and with a slight textual emendation Am. 7:4 [Hillers reads "rain of fire"]). Isa. 34:9 mentions burning pitch and brimstone.

2. *The Fire of God's Wrath.* In the passages that have been mentioned, lightning and fire are instruments of divine judgment. The connection between fire and the fierce anger (*charon 'aph*) of Yahweh is even more intimate. We encounter this expression using a verb, *charah 'appo,* "his nose was hot = his anger was kindled."[46] Since *'aph* (→ אנף *'ānaph*) means both "nose" and "anger," it is difficult to decide the extent to which the concrete original meaning "nose" is still present or at least is still felt. The original meaning is clear only in the description of the theophany in 2 S. 22:9 = Ps. 18:9(8): "Smoke went up from his nostrils, and devouring fire from his mouth"; cf. Isa. 30:33: "the breath of Yahweh is like a stream of brimstone"; 33:11: "my breath is like a fire that will consume you"; 65:5: "These (people) are a smoke in my nostrils, a fire that burns all the day." This bold figure of anger originated in the world of legends which tell of fire-breathing creatures (see Job 41:10-13[18-21], and the fire-breathing Primal Serpent in Egyptian art). But usually it is more in keeping with the evolution of ideas and with an advanced theology to translate *'aph* by "anger" when it is connected with fire, which is also suggested by the free alternation of the parallel expressions using *'aph* (Isa. 66:15; Jer. 15:14 = 17:4; Dt. 29:19[20]; 32:22), *qin'ah,* "anger" (Dt. 29:19[20]; Ezk. 36:5; Zeph. 1:18; Ps. 79:5), *'ebhrah,* "wrath" (Ezk. 21:36[31]; 22:21,31; 38:19), *chemah,* "wrath" (Jer. 4:4 = 21:12; Nah. 1:6), and *ge'arah,* "rebuke" (Isa. 66:15). As a rule, fire is used only in comparisons, and therefore we do not encounter the concept of real judgment by fire. Also the idea of "partial judgment" remains in the preexilic period in a rather narrow sphere. The (hardly genuine) statement that "in the fire of his jealous wrath (*be'esh qin'atho*), all the earth shall be consumed" is found for the first time in Zeph. 1:18 (= 3:8); cf. also the late passages, Isa. 33:11f.; Joel 2:3; Zec. 12:6.[47]

[45] See below, 3.
[46] *KBL*[3], 74.
[47] *TDNT*, VI, 936, n. 46.

Copyrighted material

3. *In the Theophany*. a. In God's angry judgment the lightning flashes, his anger burns like fire, and he even breathes out fire. Here already it is clear more or less that what we are dealing with is God's powerful manifestation, which is made known, among other ways, through fire. The best-known example is the theophany at Sinai. According to the Elohistic tradition (Ex. 19:16,19; 20:18,21), the accompanying natural phenomena are claps of thunder and flashes of lightning, dark clouds and trumpet blasts (a cultic motif), thus predominantly aspects of a storm. According to the Yahwistic tradition (19:18), Yahweh descends on the mountain in fire, accompanied by smoke like the smoke of a kiln; the smoking mountain in 20:18 also is probably an element of the Yahwistic narrative. The picture reflected in this source [48] may be based on that of a volcano, if indeed it is true that fire and smoke (see Isa. 4:5; 6:4; etc.) are not usually included in the description of a theophany. In Ex. 34:5, J also speaks of the "cloud." Similarly, P says (Ex. 24:16f.) that the cloud covered the mountain, and the *kabhodh*, "glory," of Yahweh looked like a devouring fire. Frequently Deuteronomy mentions that Yahweh spoke "out of the midst of the fire" (Dt. 4:12,15,33,36; 5:4, 22-26; 10:4; stated in more detail in 4:11). Jeremias emphasizes that in the Sinai theophany "fire is the phenomenon that accompanies or mediates the manifestation of Yahweh." [49] But in the true genre of theophany descriptions, it is "either Yahweh's irresistible weapon, . . . or a symbol and actualization of his burning anger."

b. This essentially different form-critical category appears in the hymnic theophanies of judgment, which exhibit a strong mythological hue (esp. Ps. 18:8-16[7-15]; 77:17-20[16-19]; 97:2-5; Isa. 29:6; 30:27-31; Hab. 3:2-15). In these passages, we encounter the following motifs having to do with fire: smoke going out from Yahweh's nostrils and devouring fire from his mouth, glowing coals, lightnings (Ps. 18:9,13,15[8,12,14]); lightnings (77:18f.[17f.]); fire and lightnings (97:3f.); furious anger and devouring fire (Isa. 29:6; 30:27,30); brightness like light, rays, fiery anger, light of thine arrows, flash of thy glittering spear (Hab. 3:4,8,9,11). "Before him is a devouring fire, round about him a mighty tempest" (Ps. 50:3).

c. In addition to the storm theophanies, there is a series of other manifestations involving fire through which God's presence is made known. In the story of God's covenant with Abraham, God's presence is made known mysteriously by the expressions "smoking fire pot" and "flaming torch" (Gen.15:17). Yahweh appears to Moses in a flame of fire in the bush (Ex. 3:2). In the wilderness wandering, the pillar of cloud by day and the pillar of fire by night are signs of the divine presence and leadership, Ex. 13:21; 14:24(J); Nu. 9:15(P); 14:14(J); Dt. 1:33; Ps. 78:14. Of course, the ancient narrators would have understood this literally. But in Dt. 9:3, the motif of the pillar of fire is transferred figuratively to the conquest of Canaan: "he who goes over before you as a devouring fire is

---

48 According to J. Jeremias, 104, also P and D.

49 Jeremias, 108.

Copyrighted material

a whole, Yahweh is by no means regarded as a storm-god or a fire demon. Usually the personality of Yahweh (his name and, in the prophets, his word), which is revealed especially in historical acts, is depicted to man in such a way as to make the storm phenomena (which are also mentioned later) symbols of the mighty acts of God. This is always the case in a poetic-hymnic literary genre, and in the prophets only in a visionary revelation. But fire is also a form of the external manifestation of God, since it is a gracious sign of his presence, e.g., in the bush, on Sinai, or in the pillar of fire, and yet his nature is more hidden behind it than revealed. The priestly theology in particular has substituted the idea of → כבוד *kābhôdh*, "glory," for that of fire, i.e., his "glory" is veiled, usually in the cloud (Ex. 16:10; 24:15-17; 40:34-38; etc.).[55] In this way an attempt is made to reconcile the tension between the visible manifestation and the invisible nature of God. To be sure, there is a connection between *kabhodh*, "glory," and fire, but it is not close and inseparable.

V. In Apocalyptic Literature.

1. *Ezekiel and Daniel.* In the growing apocalypticism with its heavenly visions, again light and fire frequently are features of the transcendental world. "The appearance of the likeness of the *kabhodh*, 'glory,' of Yahweh" was a brightness like that of the rainbow (Ezk. 1:28). God himself has a human form, whose outlines are enveloped in brightness (vv. 26f.). The "Ancient of Days" in Dnl. 7:9 is described more clearly. His raiment is white as snow, his throne is fiery flames whose wheels are burning fire. An angelic being is described in this way in 10:6: "his face was like the appearance of lightning, his eyes like flaming torches." 1 En. 14:9-22; Rev. 1:13-16; 4:3-5 contain similar figures from the late period.

2. *Eschatological Fire.* The concept of the eschatological destruction of the enemies of God either on earth or in the fire of Hell is late and not typical for the OT. Mal. 3:19(4:1), "the day that comes will burn them up," was the point of departure for this idea. Moreover, using the murderous fire of Topheth in the Valley of Hinnom as the basis of comparison, the late postexilic passage Isa. 66:24 (quoted in Mk. 9:48) says, still quite obscurely, "their worm shall not die, their fire shall not be quenched." Jth. 16:17, "fire and worms he will give to their flesh," is dependent on this.[56]

The Apocalyptic Literature connects the end of the world with the belief in a conflagration of the world,[57] which is also found in the NT (2 Pet. 3:7). The view that the idea of the conflagration of the world probably already existed in Zephaniah[58] is not tenable.[59]

Hamp

---

[55] See Eichrodt, 29-35; von Rad, 243.

[56] On the important role of fire in the Apocrypha and in Revelation, cf. Volz, 318f., who also discusses hell fire, 323f.; *TDNT*, VI, 937ff.

[57] Volz, 353f.; Mayer, 120ff.

[58] Bousset-Gressmann, *Die Religion des Judentums* (³1926), 503.

[59] Mayer, 95-99.

Material com direitos autorais

3. The root *'šm* is not found in South Semitic. Neither the Ethiop. *ḥašämä,* "to be wicked, offensive," nor the Tigr. *ḥasämä,* "to be wicked" (which is to be compared with Tigré *ḥasama,* "pig") have anything to do with Heb. *'šm.* This connection goes back to Dillmann,[6] was considered possible by Leslau,[7] and thus found its way into *KBL²,* where, however, it is followed by a question mark.[8] According to the principles of phonetics, a "primitive Semitic" root *'ṯm* must have produced in Geʿez *'sm,* but not *ḥšm.* Furthermore, the root *ḥšm* is by no means limited to Abyssinia (Ethiopia), but appears as well in Syriac, where it has the meaning "to envy," and is found in Arabic with the meaning "to shame."[9]

4. It is impossible to demonstrate an etymological connection between the Heb. root *'šm* and the divine names *'šmvn* or *'šmbyt'l,* or between *'šm* and *'ashimah.*[10] And it is equally difficult to accept the recent conjecture of Zimmerli that etymologically the root *'šm* can hardly be detached from *šmm,* "to be desolated," which was apparently motivated by the translation of various forms of the root *'šm* in the sense of *šmm* in the ancient versions (e.g., the LXX in Hos. 5:15; 10:2; 14:1[13:16]).[11]

Thus outside Hebrew, the root *'šm* occurs only in Arabic and perhaps in Ugaritic. In postbiblical Hebrew, it does not exhibit any special characteristics worthy of note.

II. The noun 'āshām. The greatest diversity of meaning appears in the noun *'āshām,* while the verb reveals very few nuances in meaning.

1. *In Preexilic Passages.* a. In the Pentateuch, *'āshām* occurs in the ancient source J in Gen. 26:10 (cf. the adj. in E, Gen. 42:21). In the oldest form of the tradition of the betrayal of the tribal mother, Isaac, who had said that Rebekah was his sister, is reproved by Abimelech of Gerar, because by his deception Isaac risked occasioning for Abimelech the guilt of open adultery. *'āshām* also appears in the later period with this meaning of guilt, which brings punishment in the time of Yahweh's vengeance, e.g., in Jer. 51:5. Ps. 68:22(21) states that he who walks arrogantly before Yahweh in his guilty ways (pl. here only) will certainly perish.

b. 1 S. 6 presents a different meaning. When the Philistines send the ark back into Israelite territory in order to be delivered from the catastrophes they had suffered, at the advice of the Philistine clergy they put five golden tumors and

---

[6] A. Dillmann, *Lexicon Linguae Aethiopicae* (1865), 80b; cf. also the reference in *BDB,* 79b.

[7] Leslau, *Contributions,* 12.

[8] *KBL²,* 92b.

[9] Cf. C. Brockelmann, *LexSyr²,* 274a. I am indebted to W. W. Müller of Tübingen for information concerning the South Semitic.

[10] Cf. below on Am. 8:14.

[11] W. Zimmerli, *Ezechiel. BK,* XIII, 508.

Material com direitos autorais

five golden mice beside it on the cart as an *ʾāshām* for Yahweh. We are unable to go into details here (as into the question of whether the combination of tumors and mice is original), but it is clear that *ʾāshām* in 1 S. 6:3,4,8,17 (LXX *básanos,* "torture, torment") means "propitiatory sacrifice, compensation, indemnification." The verb *shubh* in the hiphil, "to return," which is also connected with *ʾāshām,* e.g., in Nu. 5:7, and the number five, which calls to mind the law that 20 percent was to be added to the *ʾāshām* (Lev. 5:16,24[6:5]; 22:14; Nu. 5:7), allow us to conjecture that in 1 S. 6 *ʾāshām* is to be seen in close connection with the earlier idea that *ʾāshām* is a technical term used in the law of retribution, a usage that can still be detected in P.

2. *In the Priestly Code and in Postexilic Texts.* Out of all the occurrences of *ʾāshām* in the OT (48), the overwhelming majority (32) appear in P. Of course, scholars have long recognized that *ʾāshām* does not always have the same meaning within P. Furthermore, it is hardly possible to distinguish between *ʾāshām* and *chattaʾth* in the texts as they exist in their present form.

a. The uncertain distinction between the roots *ḥtʾ* and *ʾšm* can already be seen in the ancient versions. Thus, e.g., in Lev. 5:5 the Samaritan Pentateuch has *yecheta'* for *yeʾsham* of the MT (cf. also Nu. 18:9, where the Samaritan Pentateuch has *yeʾshamu* for *yashibhu,* "to render," of the MT). The LXX omits Lev. 5:2b where the MT reads *ʾashem,* has nothing corresponding to *yeʾsham* in Lev. 5:5a, and seems to want to read *ʿal chattaʾtho,* "for his sin," instead of *ʾeth ʾashamo* in Lev. 5:7. The rendering of *ʾāshām* by the root *plēmmel-,* "sin-,"[12] in the LXX makes it quite clear that an interpretation has replaced a sacrificial term in this translation. The Syriac Peshitta also, by its very general translation of *ʾāshām* by *qwrbn'*, e.g., in Lev. 5 and 7, indicates that it has a sacrificial idea in mind. But at the same time, the rendering of *ʾāshām* by *ḥṭh'* in Lev. 7:5; chap. 14; and 19:21f., and of Heb. *chattaʾth* in the same way, shows that the translators of the Peshitta were unable to find an appropriate term in Syriac to correspond to Heb. *ʾāshām.*

Furthermore, ancient authors no longer knew the meaning of *ʾāshām.* Thus, Philo of Alexandria tries to explain the difference between *ʾasham* and *chattaʾth* on the basis of the use of these words in the LXX. He argues that *chattaʾth* refers to all unintentional transgressions against man, while *ʾasham* is used for unintentional sins against the Holy One and for intentional sins against man.[13] Flavius Josephus, who is a little later than Philo, has no more precise information about the meaning of *ʾāshām* than Philo did, in spite of having come from a priestly family. The distinction he makes (*Ant.* iii.9.3) is that a *chattaʾth* was to be sacrificed for sins of ignorance, while an *ʾāshām* was to be sacrificed for all deliberate sins which no one witnessed. Origen thinks that the *chattaʾth* was the sacrifice offered to atone for mortal sins, and that the *ʾāshām* was the

---

[12] Cf. S. Daniel, *Recherches sur le vocabulaire du culte dans le Septante* (1966), 299-326 and 341-361.

[13] *De specialibus legibus, I, de victimis,* ed. L. Cohn, V (1906), 226-238.

Material com direitos autorais

sacrifice offered to atone for venial sins.[14] Augustine adopts the translation of the Vulgate and thinks that *chatta'th* referred to sinful deeds (*peccatum*), thus to intentional transgressions, and that *'āshām* referred to unintentional transgressions.[15] Jerome, whose translation Augustine adopts, agrees with this interpretation when he defines *'āshām* as a sacrifice *pro delicto sive pro ignorantia,* "for sin or for ignorance."[16]

The views of modern authors are just as different as those of ancient writers. Herrmann sees no fundamental difference between the meaning of *chatta'th* and *'āshām.*[17] Médebielle believes that the unique feature of the *'āshām* is that it is a restitution for trespasses, which presupposes a more severe sin than is assumed in the fundamental idea of propitiation, which is denoted by *chatta'th.*[18] Schötz concludes that ultimately the purpose of the *'āshām*-sacrifice was to atone for a sacrilege,[19] viz., "a transgression against the deity himself as pertains to holy things or holy persons, either against a specifically required holiness or by unauthorized use of the divine name."[20] Again, the distinction Saydon makes[21] amounts to differentiating between deliberate transgressions ("which are due to human frailty"[22]), which are to be expiated by a *chatta'th,* and unintentional, inadvertent transgressions which are to be expiated by an *'āshām.* Conversely, Thomson thinks that *'āshām* was considered to be atonement for intentional sins.[23] Moraldi concludes that both the *chatta'th* and the *'āshām* serve as atonement for sins and transgressions, but that in the *'āshām* the aspect of restitution is added.[24] Gaster emphasizes the reparational aspect of *'āshām* even more.[25] He argues that the *'āshām* is a "fine." Snaith argues that the *'āshām* serves as a restitution, especially for wrongs that have actually been committed.[26] Rendtorff conjectures that the *'āshām* was the "older form of the expiatory sacrifice for the individual," which was largely replaced by the *chatta'th.*[27]

b. Questions concerning the difference between *'āshām* and *chatta'th,* and concerning a possible development of the meaning of *'āshām* within P, can be answered only by a thorough analysis of the texts. Elliger has already done this in Leviticus,[28] and his conclusions will be discussed here. *'āshām* is used several times in the sacrificial laws of Lev. 1–7. In the first supplement to the law of

---

14 *MPG,* 12, 453.
15 *MPL,* 34, 681f.
16 Cf. Jerome's comm. on Ezk. 40:39; 42:13; 44:29; *CChr,* LXXV, 582, 703.
17 J. Herrmann, *Die Idee der Sühne im AT* (1905), 78f.
18 A. Médebielle, 57, 61, and *DBS,* 3, 56-59.
19 D. Schötz, 32ff.
20 *Ibid.,* 45.
21 P. P. Saydon, 397f.
22 *Ibid.,* 398.
23 H. C. Thomson, 24.
24 L. Moraldi, 180ff.; *RivBibl,* 294f.
25 T. H. Gaster, "Sacrifices and Offerings, OT," *IDB,* IV, 147-159, esp. 152.
26 N. H. Snaith, 79f.
27 R. Rendtorff, 207-211.
28 K. Elliger, *HAT,* 4.

Material com direitos autorais

that the separation between God and the sick was considered to be so serious that only an *'āshām* could make restitution for the sin as a compensation.

An *'āshām*-sacrifice is also necessary when a man lies carnally with a woman who is a slave, betrothed to another man, Lev. 19:21f. Since in this case the wrongdoer cannot be punished according to civil law, although he is guilty, in dependence on 5:25(6:6) a ram is required as a compensatory sacrifice for the trespass.

The *'āshām*-sacrifice, which the Nazirite must offer in addition to cleansing ceremonies when his Nazirite vow is violated as a result of his having touched a dead body (Nu. 6:12), is usually understood as a later addition. However, since *'āshām* should probably be understood as a "restitution" here, and since the violation of the vow is an offense against Yahweh's possession, viz., the time pledged to him, the *'āshām* a priori will have belonged to the sin-offering and the burnt-offering of the Nazirite. [31]

The *'āshām*-sacrifice is not an ancient type of sacrifice, but developed from the *chatta'th* as an atonement sacrifice for all cases of gross negligence, and ultimately as a guilt-offering in difficult cases.

c. Some conclusions can be drawn from the ritual handed down in Lev. 7:1ff.: killing the animal in the holy place, the blood rite, offering the fat, burning the fat, and the regulations about eating the sacrifice. It is worthy of note that the rite of laying hands on the *'āshām* is not mentioned. The blood rite differs from that of the sin-offering: the blood is not sprinkled on the horns of the altar with the finger, nor is the remaining blood poured out at the base of the altar, but it is sprinkled on the altar round about, as in the burnt-offering and the sacrifice of peace-offering. The rite of burning the fat resembles that of the sin-offering of a sheep. The clear dependence of the ritual in Lev. 7 on various other sacrifices indicates that in its present form it is a relatively late development, the purpose of which was to distinguish between the rite of the *'āshām* and that of the sin-offering, and to provide a form of sacrifice which would stand between the sin-offering and the burnt-offering. Perhaps this is one reason why the *'āshām* is not a part of the ritual of one of the great festivals in Israel, in contrast to the *chatta'th* and even more naturally to the *'olah* (cf. Nu. 28f.).

d. A verse some scholars like to cite as a proof of the great antiquity of the *'āshām*-offering is 2 K. 12:17(16), which speaks of the *keseph 'asham*, "money from the guilt-offerings," and the *keseph chatta'oth*, "money from the sin-offerings," in connection with the account of the beginning of the collection to pay the men who worked on repairing the temple. But this argument cannot stand up under scrutiny because v. 17 is a later addition, [32] reflecting conditions in the postexilic period.

---

[31] Cf. *ibid.*, 88ff.

[32] Cf. also Rendtorff, 54.

Copyrighted material

e. The experiences that are intensified in times of great catastrophe, when sins and guilt severely strain the relationship between God and man, explain why the Jews in the postexilic period had such a lively interest in thinking about and reflecting on means of expiating sin. The literary remains from this period in the Priestly Code reveal the fervor with which the movement to guilt-offerings and sin-offerings was carried out.

a. *Isa. 53:10.* A particularly prominent passage in the last Ebhedh-Yahweh Song, Isa. 52:13–53:12, also speaks of *āshām.* Not only does this song compare the servant with a lamb that is led to the slaughter (53:7), but it also says that he makes his soul an *'āshām* "offering for sin." [33] The vicarious suffering of the righteous is the guilt-offering for the many. Like a guilt-offering, the death of the Servant results in atonement, the salvation of sinners from death.

It is not clear how *'āshām* is to be understood in Prov. 14:9. The parallel *ratson* could indicate that it means a guilt-offering, but the text is probably corrupt. [34]

III. The Verb. 1. The verb *'āsham* appears in the OT 33 times in the qal and once in the hiphil (Ps. 5:11[10]). The formal example of the niphal in Joel 1:18 should be read *nāshammu,* "are dismayed," with the LXX and derived from *shamem.* [35] With regard to the 33 occurrences of this verb in the qal, we should omit it in Hab. 1:11 as a textual error (and read *veyasim,* "and he set," with 1QpHab), but add it in Ezk. 35:6 (reading *'ashamta,* "you are guilty," with the LXX instead of *sane'tha,* "you have hated"). [36] A concrete sense of *'asham* probably preceded the abstract range of its meaning in the qal, "to act wrongly, to become guilty, to become culpable, to atone for guilt," perhaps in a way similar to the verb *chatta',* "to miss a target" > "to sin." But this concrete sense can no longer be determined from the existing occurrences of *'asham.* *'asham* can be connected with a preposition, and then it means to become guilty of something mentioned previously in the context (Lev. 5:4f.), or of a crime against other people (Nu. 5:7), or in particular of a crime against Yahweh (Lev. 5:19; 2 Ch. 19:10).

2. No change in the meaning of *'asham* can be ascertained between the preexilic and postexilic periods. In connection with the abduction of the Benjaminite women, Jgs. 21:22 emphasizes that the relatives of these women were not held guilty because the abduction occurred without their knowledge.

a. In Hosea, the verb occurs five times (4:15; 5:15; 10:2; 13:1; 14:1[13:16]). The contention that in Hosea *'asham* means "to make a sin-offering, to atone

---

[33] Cf. recently E. Kutsch, *Sein Leiden und Tod–unser Heil. BSt,* 52 (1967); K. Elliger, "Jes 53,10: alte crux–neuer Vorschlag," *Festschrift R. Meyer. MIO,* 15 (1969), 228-233; W. Zimmerli, *SVT,* 17 (1969), 238ff.

[34] Cf. the comms. *in loc.*

[35] Cf. H. W. Wolff, *BK,* XIV/2, 22, n. 18c.

[36] W. Zimmerli, *BK,* XIII/2, 852, n. 6c.

Copyrighted material

III. 1. *Goddess.* While Aṯirat was still the wife of El at Ugarit, in the OT Asherah appears as the companion of Baal (Jgs. 3:7; 1 K. 18:19; 2 K. 23:4; cf. Jgs. 6:26; 1 K. 16:32f.; 2 K. 17:16; 2 Ch. 33:3, where the symbol of the goddess is connected with the worship of Baal). This OT picture probably represents a later development, which begins to appear toward the end of the second millennium B.C., and can be attributed to the gradual fusion of the Canaanite fertility goddesses Anat and Astarte with the mother-goddess Asherah.[25] This fusion is also evident from the occurrence in the OT of the expression *habbe'alim veha'asheroth,* "the Baals and the Asheroth" (Jgs. 3:7; cf. 2 Ch. 33:3), in addition to the proverbial phrase *habba'al veha'ashtaroth,* "the Baal and the Ashtaroth" (Jgs. 2:13), or *habbe'alim veha'ashtaroth,* "the Baals and the Ashtaroth" (10-6; 1 S. 7:4; 12:10), while the LXX translates *'asherah* by *Astartē* in 2 Ch. 15:16, and *'asherim* by *Astartai* in 2 Ch. 24:18. When one compares 2 K. 23:4-6 with 23:13f., the cult object *'asherah* seems to be connected with both the Asherah cult (in v. 4 probably a proper name; cf. 21:7) and the Astarte cult.

The genuine character of the mother-goddess is forced entirely into the background in this fusion process, and now Asherah appears primarily as a fertility goddess. Women in particular were attracted to her cult (1 K. 15:13; 2 K. 23:7; also 1 K. 11:1-8 with regard to 2 K. 23:13f.). They would weave *battim* for Asherah, viz., in the temple area where the hierodules lived (2 K. 23:7). This weaving of *battim* may be a euphemism for sexual intercourse.[26] According to another explanation, *bath* here is an article of clothing[27] with which the image of the goddess was clothed. On this, one should compare not only Egyptian, Babylonian, and Greek parallels, but also Ugaritic texts in which articles of clothing are mentioned for the images of ʿAṯtart and other goddesses. In any case, erotic ideas were often connected with spinning and weaving in the ancient Near East.[28] Now it is interesting that at Ugarit neither ʿAnat nor ʿAṯtart is represented as patroness of this typical female activity, but Aṯirat,[29] so that here possibly an element of the original Asherah concept has been preserved.

If the conjecture made by Wellhausen that we should read *'anatho ve'ashratho,* "his Anat and his Asherah," in Hos. 14:9(8) instead of the MT,[30] were correct, this would mean that Asherah and Anat were explicitly put side by side. This would also provide a good contact with v. 9b(8b), viz., that her symbol was an evergreen tree. However, this conjecture is probably "more ingenious than correct."[31]

2. *Cult Object.* The goddess and her cult object of the same name were not sharply differentiated, as a comparison of 2 K. 21:3 with 21:7 and of 23:4 with 23:6 shows. This is nothing unusual in the history of religion; Canaanite examples

---

25 See above, II.
26 Murmelstein, *ZAW,* 81 (1969), 223f.
27 *KBL*[3], 159.
28 Murmelstein, *ZAW,* 81, 215ff.; Hoffner, *JBL,* 85 (1966), 326ff.
29 See above, II.
30 J. Wellhausen, *Skizzen and Vorarbeiten,* V (²1893), 131.
31 Sellin.

Material com direitos autorais

also make this clear (cf. Dagon). There is no precise description of the *ʾasherah* as a cult object in the OT, which is certainly related to its being offensive to the OT writers. As a result, there is uncertainty as to the true nature of the *ʾasherah* in the ancient versions: frequently this word has been understood as grove, sometimes as a single tree, as a pole, cult image, or goddess. [32] Modern research has not been able to remove this uncertainty. Due to the inadequacy of the written sources, various archeological identifications can be nothing more than very hypothetical.

The Mishnah considered the *ʾasherah* to be a living tree (*Orla* i.7f.; *ʿAbodah Zarah* iii.7,9f.; *Sukkah* iii.1-3). As a matter of fact, with reference to Dt. 16:21 one could think of *ʾasherah* as a living tree which is "planted" (*nataʿ*). But *kol ʿets,* "any tree," is ambiguous and can refer just as well to dead wood. The verb *nataʿ* may have been used in a figurative sense with the meaning "to drive in (a pole)" (cf. Eccl. 12:11; Dnl. 11:45), because in other passages the Asherim were "set up" (hiphil of *natsabh,* 2 K. 17:10; hiphil of *ʿamadh,* 2 Ch. 33:19; *sim,* 2 K. 21:7), and according to Isa. 27:9 they "stood" (*qum*). These verbs probably indicate an oblong object which was driven vertically into the ground. This is confirmed by Jgs. 6:25,28,30, according to which the *ʾasherah* jutted up beside the altar (for this use of *ʿal,* cf. Gen. 16:7; 18:8; etc.; of course an object of wood did not stand *on* the altar).

"Asherim" in Mic. 5:13(14) could also refer to a tree, as could be indicated by the verb *nathash,* "root out" (cf. Jer. 12:14,15; 24:6; etc.), and by the parallel to "Asherim" in the next line, *ʿarekha,* which since J. D. Michaelis has often been understood as a species of tree. However, *nathash* can very well have the more general meaning "pluck up"; and even if **ʿr* indicates a species of tree, it is not necessarily in synonymous parallelism with "Asherim."

If Albright is correct in conjecturing that we should read *vekha'allon ʾasher(ah)* in Isa. 6:13, [33] this could be used as evidence that the oak was consecrated to Asherah. But this suggestion is probably too daring. [34] The same is true of Wellhausen's conjecture on Hos. 14:9(8). [35]

Although living trees and bushes are still worshipped in Syria and Palestine, and holy trees (→ עֵץ *ʿēts*) played a role in the OT, it is not to be assumed that the name *ʾasherah* was used in this connection. Undoubtedly the *ʾasherah* was an object made of wood (Dt. 16:21; Jgs. 6:26), which was driven into the ground. [36] Thus, it could also be hewed down (Dt. 7:5; 2 Ch. 14:2[3]; 31:1), cut down (Ex. 34:13; Jgs. 6:25f.,30; 2 K. 18:4; 23:14), rooted out (Mic. 5:13[14]), pulled down (2 Ch. 34:7), and burned (Dt. 12:3; Jgs. 6:26; 2 K. 23:6,15). But a living tree cannot be intended, because the Asherim were "made" (1 K. 14:15; 16:33; 2 K. 17:16; 21:3,7; Isa. 17:8), and they stood under green trees (1 K. 14:23; 2 K. 17:10).

---

[32] Reed, 6ff.; Barr, *JSS,* 13 (1968), 14ff.
[33] Albright, *SVT,* 4 (1957), 254.
[34] Wildberger, *BK,* X, 324.
[35] See above.
[36] See above.

Material com direitos autorais

Once the OT mentions the making of a graven image (*pesel*) of Asherah (2 K. 21:7); it is called *pesel hassemel,* "the image of the idol," in 2 Ch. 33:7, and simply *hassemel,* "the idol," in 2 Ch. 33:15 (which is not to be identified with *semel haqqin'ah,* "image of jealousy," in Ezk. 8:5). Another passage says that a *miphletseth,* "an abominable image," was made for Asherah (1 K. 15:13). These passages also indicate that the cult object actually represented the goddess Asherah, as the name itself would lead us to expect. This symbol usually stood on a cultic high place (→ במה *bāmāh*) near an altar and/or an incense altar. The *'asherah* was often associated with a raised stone (→ מצבה *matstsēbhāh*).

Some scholars have supposed that the *'asherah* was an object made out of wood in the form of a pole, perhaps decorated with carved work. Since this stage was probably preceded by a phase in which the raised stone was combined with a living or dead tree, it is possible to assume that the *'asherah* was a stylized tree, as it appears, e.g., on a clay model of a cultic scene from Cyprus.[37] On the other hand, that the same object is called *pesel ha'asherah,* "the graven image of Asherah," in one passage (2 K. 21:7), and simply *ha'asherah,* "the Asherah," in another (23:6), probably favors the view that it was an image of a god. Under no circumstances can the word → פסל *pesel* be interpreted so as to refer to a tree-trunk the branches or protrusions of which were chopped off, because such treatment would have desecrated the tree (cf. the Mishnah *'Abodah Zarah* iii.10). The expression *(pesel) hassemel,* "(the image of) the idol," which is used in 2 Ch. 33:7,15, also points to an image of the goddess.

Frequently the Asherim are mentioned in connection with other images of gods (Dt. 7:5; 12:3; 2 K. 17:16; Mic. 5:12f.[13f.]; 2 Ch. 24:18; 33:19; 34:3f.,7). This could give the impression that they are distinguished from "regular" images. It is possible, however, that they are specifically mentioned because they represent the most important female deity. In interpreting the Asherim as an image, the fact that they are always made of wood leaves open the possibility that this image took over the function that formerly belonged to the tree. The frequent combination of *'asherah* and *matstsebhah,* "pillar," is interesting in this regard. Stone and tree were combined at Ugarit,[38] and according to the OT both attributes were found in ancient sanctuaries, as at Shechem (Josh. 24:26), Bethel (Gen. 28:18ff.; 35:8), and Ophrah (Jgs. 6:11,19f.,24ff.). It is noteworthy that the OT often speaks of appearances and revealed messages which were given to the patriarchs and judges at these holy places. Trees and stones were also specifically connected with the oracle at Ugarit. When Hosea says that the people inquire of "a thing of wood" (4:12), this could refer to the *'asherah,* which was later mentioned in connection with the *matstsebhah,* "pillar," instead of the tree. As the *'asherah* is the symbol of the fertility goddess, the *matstsebhah* is the symbol of the fertility god Baal (2 K. 3:2; 10:26f.). We have already seen that the tree-oracle and the stone-oracle were specifically connected with these deities at Ugarit.

---

[37] *BRL,* 35f.; *BHHW,* I, 137.

[38] See above, II.

Material com direitos autorais

אַשְׁרֵי *'ashrê*

Contents: I. 1. Lexicographical Matters; 2. Usage. II. 1. Theology of the Blessing in the Psalms; 2. In Proverbs and Late Writings. III. The Blessing in the Development of Biblical Theology.

I. 1. *Lexicographical Matters.* *'ashre* is a masculine plural construct, and was interpreted as a type of interjection at a very early time.[1] Some scholars have taken it to be a segholate noun derived from the root *'šr,* "to go," which is known in Hebrew, Ugaritic, and Arabic. The verb, which is rarely used in the qal (Prov. 9:6), frequently occurs in the piel in Isaiah with the meaning "to lead." But the piel also means that a person "happily" transfers his (implied in the root) property to someone, and thus means "to make (someone) happy." This meaning is found in Gen. 30:13 (probably J) and in seven late passages (Mal. 3:12; Prov. 31:28; Job 29:11; Cant. 6:9; Ps. 72:17; pual, Prov. 3:18; Ps. 41:3 [Eng. v. 2]). Gen. 30:13 presupposes a segholate of another sort, which would be *'osher* according to the MT. Some lexicographers assume a different root related to the root *yšr,* "to be upright," which they identify with the Akk. *wašāru,*[2] but the Akkadian equivalent to *yšr* is *'ešēru,* "to be in order (right, correct)." The Egyptian transcriptions of Semitic names from the period of the Middle Kingdom may also point to a root *'šr* which is distinct from the Ugar. *'ṯr.*[3] Moreover, Janzen has shown that *'ashre* is not to be interpreted as an antithesis to the cry of woe, *hoy,* "Ah! Alas!"

Just because the blessing formula *barukh,* "Blessed be (is)," in Israel is very old does not mean that the same is true of *'ashre.* This word appears only rarely in J (Gen. 30:13), E (Dt. 33:29 in the final portion of Dt., which is a redactional ending), Isaiah (30:18), and 1 Kings (10:8, which is probably redactional). It occurs most frequently in the Psalms (26 times) and in the Wisdom books (12 times

---

'ashrê. A. Barucq, *L'expression de la louange divine et de la prière dans la Bible et en Egypte* (Cairo, 1962), 262, 482; G. Bertram, "μακάριος," *TDNT,* IV (1967), 364-367; J. Dupont, *Les Béatitudes* (Bruges-Louvain, ²1958); *idem,* "Béatitudes égyptiennes," *Bibl,* 47 (1966), 185-222; A. George, "La 'forme' des béatitudes jusqu'à Jésus," *Mélanges Bibliques en l'honneur de A. Robert* (Paris, 1957), 398-403; W. Janzen, "'Ašrê' in the OT," *HThR,* 58 (1965), 215-226; W. Käser, "Beobachtungen zum alttestamentlichen Makarismus," *ZAW,* 82 (1970), 225-250; C. Keller, "Les Béatitudes de l'AT," *Maqqel Shâqêdh, Hommage à W. Vischer* (Montpellier, 1960), 88-100; R. Kieffer, "Vishet och välsignelse som grundmotiv i saligprisningarna hos Matteus och Lukas," *SEÅ,* 34 (1969), 107-121; E. Lipiński, "Macarismes et psaumes de congratulation," *RB,* 75 (1968), 321-367; S. Mowinckel, *Segen und Fluch in Israels Kult und Psalmendichtung. Psalmenstudien,* V (Oslo, 1923); W. Zimmerli, "Zur Struktur der at.lichen Weisheit," *ZAW,* 51 (1933), 175-204.

1 *GK,* § 93 l.
2 *GesB, KBL.*
3 Albright, *JAOS,* 74 (1954).

Material com direitos autorais

outside the Greek portions of Sir.). While *'ashre* is found only once each in Job and Ecclesiastes, it occurs relatively often in Proverbs in antithetical parallelism (which Zimmerli and Lipiński consider to be a distortion of the pure form) in collections which are regarded as the oldest (14:21; 16:20; 20:7; 29:18).

2. *Usage. 'ashre* occurs most often in the Psalms. It opens the Psalter in 1:1, is found at the end of Ps. 2 (Acts 13:33 D considers these two psalms as a unit; cf. *Berakhoth* 9b), is missing from the first two books of the Psalms with the exception of the last psalm in each group (32–41 and 65), occurs in the psalms concluding collections I (41:2[1]), III (89:16[15]), and IV (106:3), and finally appears quite often in the last book (8 times, in particular in 119:1f.).

This evidence will hardly allow one to deny a connection between *'ashre* and the liturgy of the Second Temple. *'ashre* is a liturgical cry, and its late connection with the verb *'šr* points to an act in which believers seek happiness; it was probably the pilgrimage to the temple in the sense of the Deuteronomistic movement and the return from the exile. This act makes the believers "happy," thus explaining the translation by Gk. *makários* and Aram. *ṭûbai*.

II. 1. *Theology of the Blessing in the Psalms.* What is the connection between this cry of happiness and the blessing? According to Mowinckel, there is no difference between the words *'ashre* and *barukh,*[4] but according to Kraus the "more secular" *'ashre* should be distinguished from the sacral-solemn *barukh.*[5] Kraus is probably correct, because this cry of happiness never refers to God (even in Dt. 33:29 Israel is happy because she has been saved by God). The desire for happiness is different from the blessing in that it demands that the believer do certain things: he must come to Zion (Ps. 65:5[4]; 84:5[4]; as well as Isa. 30:18; cf. v. 19), where refuge (*chasah*) is to be found (Ps. 2:12; 34:9[8]; cf. 84:13[12]), and where sins are forgiven (32:1,2). But in harmony with the Deuteronomistic view, happiness depends on the choice (Ps. 33:12) or teaching of God (94:12). The believer must fear God (112:1; 128:1). His behavior must be blameless (119:1f.), and he must obey the Torah and not follow the counsel of the wicked (1:1). Happy is he who considers the poor (41:2[1]), who observes justice and does *tsedhaqah,* "righteousness" (106:3), who receives sons as a gift from God in his youth (127:5), and who executes God's judgment against the enemies of the chosen people (137:8).

2. *In Proverbs and Late Writings.* We find an echo of this view in the parallel constructions in Proverbs. Happiness belongs to those who take refuge in God (Prov. 16:20), who have pity on the oppressed (14:21), who are given children (20:7), and who keep the Torah (29:18). Similarly, the fear of God (which is often made a fundamental demand in this book) as the beginning of wisdom is connected with the blessing that comes on those who fear God (28:14).

---

[4] S. Mowinckel, *The Psalms in Israel's Worship* (1962), 47.
[5] H.-J. Kraus, *BK,* X/1, 3.

Material com direitos autorais

The later literature also takes up this theme. Happy are those who find wisdom, the tree of life (Prov. 3:13), or who listen to the wisdom created by God and watch at her gates (8:33f.). This is connected with the poem concerning the woman whose excellence motivates her children to bless her (31:28). Eliphaz reminds Job that God connects happiness with reproof (Job 5:17). When one heard Job speak formerly, he called him happy (29:11); but now God has thrust him out in misery.

In harmony with election theology, Mal. 3:12 says that the nations will praise Israel. In Ps. 72:17 they bless the sons of David, and in Cant. 6:9 the maidens proclaim the happiness of the female lover.

III. The Blessing in the Development of Biblical Theology. The interpretation of the biblical use of *'ashre* would not be complete without an attempt to explain its origin and meaning. Since *'ashre* has a peculiar grammatical form and was introduced into the language of the OT at a late period, it is logical to conclude that it is a foreign expression which was taken over into the OT.

In the cuneiform literature there are no satisfactory parallels. To be sure, this material does speak of success and happiness, especially in the omina,[6] and uses the expression *ṭūb libbi*, "the well-being of the heart," but all this has little to do with the use of *'ashre* in the OT. In the Babylonian hymns we encounter *cries*[7] which prepare the way for the *'ashre* of the Psalms. It is even possible that the Akk. *ašru*, which extols humility and trust[8] and is used especially in the Neo-Babylonian period (*ašri kanšu, ašri sanga; wašrum* in the Code of Hammurabi), played a certain role in Israel's adoption of the *'ashre*-formula, since the happiness of this formula is the humble reply of Israel to the call of God who had chosen her.

According to the study of J. Dupont, the pronouncement of blessings is to be found especially in Egypt. It is particularly noticeable in the late Petosiris, whose contacts with the Bible are well known: "Happy is the man who directs his heart into the way of life . . ." ; "Happy is the man who comes to his house without sin ! . . ." ; "Happy is the one who loves God ! . . ." ; "Happy is the one who directs his heart into the way of faithfulness!" These kinds of blessings are also found in Rameses II ("Happy is he who understands thee, O Amon!"), in the Tell el-Amarna tablets ("Happy is he who hears thy instruction for life"), in Thutmose III ("Happy is he who carries out the law of God in right actions," Drioton), and even in the Pyramid Texts (476, "Happy are those who look like the Pharaoh rising up to heaven").

The form of this blessing is very instructive: *rs.wy* is used of a servant who sustains his lord, of one who has God in his heart, and of a land whose lord the Pharaoh has become (Sinuhe); *wꜣḏ.wy* is applied to one who has acted well toward his lord, to him who hearkens to the instruction of life, and to one who reaches Thebes, the blessed city (Leiden Papyrus, Rameses II); *snk.wy* is used of

---

[6] Cf. F. R. Kraus, "Ein Sittenkanon in Omenform," *ZA*, 43 (1936), 77-113.
[7] E.g., in *ANET*, 386, "may my paths be straight"; 387, "may he be happy."
[8] *CAD*, I, 455; *AHw*, 82.

Material com direitos autorais

אֵת ʾēth; עִם ʿim

Contents: I. Secular Use: 1. Parallelism, Etymology, and Origin of the Prepositions *ʾeth* and *ʿim;* 2. Scope of the Secular Meaning. II. Theological Use: 1. General Considerations; 2. In the Promises of God; 3. As a Promise, Wish, etc. of Man; 4. In the Affirmative Use; 5. Content, History, and Place of the Formula Using *ʾeth* and *ʿim* in the Faith of Israel. III. *ʿImmānu ʾēl.*

I. Secular Use.

1. *Parallelism, Etymology, and Origin of the Prepositions ʾeth and ʿim.* In the history of languages, it is extraordinary when two different words belonging to the same chronological period of a language have the same meanings. Yet the OT reflects no essential difference in the meanings or uses of.*ʾeth* and *ʿim* either as to the historical periods when they occur or as to the genres in which they appear. The only thing that is clear is that in both the secular and theological realms, in later texts *ʾeth* is used less and less and *ʿim* is used more and more. Therefore, it seems justifiable to treat both prepositions together. While *ʾeth* (originally *ʾitt?*) [1] has a close affinity with the Akk. *itti* (Assyr. *išti*), [2] and (because Semitic prepositions were originally substantives) also is intimately connected with *ʾidt* (fem. form of *yd?*) or a form of *ʾnh* II, "to meet," [3] *ʿim* has a stronger association with the Northwest Semitic-Aramaic language type (cf. the Aram.; Syr. *ʿam;* Ugar. *ʿm,* intensified to *ʿmn*=*ʿimman,* cf. Hos. 12:5 [Eng. v. 4]; but also the Arab. *ʿam,* also *ʿan* and *maʿa?*). [4]

2. *Scope of the Secular Meaning.* The following representative examples should clarify the scope of variation and meaning in the two prepositions *ʾeth* and *ʿim.*

ʾēth. W. Beyerlin, *ZAW,* 73 (1961), 191; M. Buber, *VT,* 6 (1956), 137; J. L. Crenshaw, *ZAW,* 80 (1968), 207; R. Kilian, *Die Verheissung Immanuels Jes 7,14. SBS,* 35 (1968); H.-P. Müller, *Ursprünge und Strukturen alttestamentlicher Eschatologie. BZAW,* 109 (1969), 138, 142f., 151, 166f.; H. D. Preuss, " . . . ich will mit dir sein!" *ZAW,* 80 (1968), 139-173; cf. 139, n. 4, for the earlier literature; M. Rehm, *Der königliche Messias im Licht der Immanuel-Weissagungen des Buches Jesaja* (1968); W. Richter, *Die sogenannten vorprophetischen Berufungsberichte. FRLANT,* 101 (1970), 138, 146-151, 171f., 174; Ph. de Robert, *Le berger d'Israël* (Neuchâtel, 1968), 54f., 91; L. Schmidt, *Menschlicher Erfolg und Jahwes Initiative. WMANT,* 38 (1970), 37ff., 74ff., 88ff., 100f., etc.; H. Seebass, *ZAW,* 79 (1967), 162; J. J. Stamm, "Die Immanuel-Perikope im Lichte neuerer Veroffentlichungen," *ZDMG Supplement,* 1 (1969), 281-290; H. W. Wolff, *BK,* XIV/2, 294f.

[1] Cf. *KBL*[3], 97.

[2] On *ʾeth* in the field of Northwest Semitic languages, see *DISO,* 28f.; cf. also the Lachish Letters III, 20.

[3] So E. König, *Hebr. und aram. Wörterbuch zum AT* (1910), 31.

[4] Cf. further *DISO,* 215f.

Material com direitos autorais

a. *ʾeth* and *ʿim* have the following meanings: (1) "with, together with, in the company or association of": *ʾeth,* Gen. 7:7; Jgs. 9:32f.; 2 S. 16:17; Jer. 3:9; *ʿim,* Gen. 5:24; 13:1; Ex. 22:29(30); Dt. 12:23; Hos. 4:14; Eccl. 2:16; [5] (2) "at, close to, beside, in the midst of": *ʾeth,* Ex. 1:14; Lev. 19:13; Jgs. 4:11; Isa. 53:8; Job 2:13; *ʿim,* Gen. 23:4; 25:11; Dt. 22:2; 2 S. 13:23; 21:4; 1 Ch. 13:14 (*ʾeth* sometimes means "besides" in the sense "except, beyond, contrary to," Ex. 20:23; 33:21); (3) "with the help of, under the protection of": *ʾeth,* Gen. 4:1 (?); 30:29; Jgs. 17:2; *ʿim,* 1 S. 14:45; 1 Ch. 4:23; 12:19(18); (4) "provided with, in the possession of": *ʾeth,* Jer. 23:28; *ʿim,* Gen. 24:25; Ps. 89:14(13); (5) "to strive with someone, to fight with": *ʾeth,* Gen. 14:9; Jgs. 11:27; 1 Ch. 20:5; *ʿim,* Gen. 26:29; Isa. 3:14; Ps. 94:16; Job 14:3.

b. In addition to these primary meanings, *ʾeth* and *ʿim* have the following rarer or figurative meanings: (1) "in, at, upon, with reference (regard) to, for the benefit of": *ʾeth,* 1 S. 7:16; 1 K. 9:25; *ʿim,* Gen. 24:12; Ex. 34:10; (2) "as well as, in the manner of": *ʾeth,* Gen. 6:13; *ʿim,* 18:23; Ps. 73:5.

c. As *ʿim* makes its way into Hebrew more and more, it has a somewhat larger scope of meaning: (1) "to have with him=in mind," Nu. 14:24; Dt. 8:5; Job 23:14; (2) "as long as," Ps. 72:5; (3) "comparable with, in comparison with," Ps. 120:4; Job 9:26; (4) "yet" ("nevertheless"), Isa. 25:11; Neh. 5:18 (late passages); (5) "until" (temporal), Isa. 44:7 (read *ʿim*); (6) "after, toward, to," Jgs. 4:9; Ps. 18:24(23) (2 S. 22:24, *le*); Job 31:5 (cf. Ugar. *ʿm*); [6] (7) "from the way, out of," Gen. 23:4; Ps. 85:5(4); Job 27:13. [7]

The presence of one man with another is often placed in the context of "accompanying him on a journey or a trip" (Gen. 13:1,5; 18:16; 19:30; 24:32,40, 54,58; 31:23). [8] The OT does not know an erotic "association" as a formal expression. [9]

II. Theological Use.

1. *General Considerations.* In the theological realm also, the prepositions *ʾeth* and *ʿim* are used promiscuously. In over 100 passages, the OT makes statements concerning the "presence" of Yahweh [10] with individual men or with groups in the past, present, and future, without further specifying how Yahweh

---

[5] On *krt berith ʿim/ʾeth,* see E. Kutsch, *ZAW,* 79 (1967), 24f., n. 26.

[6] On this cf. M. Dahood, *Ugaritic-Hebrew Philology* (Rome, 1965), 32.

[7] Cf. further the Ugar. *ʿm* in *UT,* 2065, 14f., and M. Dahood, *Psalms,* II. *AB,* XVII (1968), 287; *idem, Bibl,* 50 (1969), 350.

[8] Further examples are mentioned in Preuss, 155, n. 60, to which 1 S. 14:7 should be added; this same note cites similar phrases in the ancient Near East.

[9] But cf. Cant. 4:8 and similar statements from the ancient Near East in Preuss, 165f.

[10] On Elohim, Yahweh Elohim, and El, see Preuss, 139, n. 1, where Job 29:5 with Shaddai should be added.

Material com direitos autorais

(J? a speech of Yahweh, since v. 23 was originally connected with v. 15; cf. further Josh. 1:5,9,17, *ʿim*); Josh. 1:9; 3:7 (*ʿim*); 7:12 (*ʿim,* here in connection with the Yahweh war); Jgs. 6:12 (*ʿim*, Gideon's further inquiry in v. 13 excludes the possibility that v. 12 should be understood as a greeting formula; cf. Lk. 1:28; otherwise Ruth 2:4; 2 Ch. 19:6);[18] Jgs. 6:16 (*ʿim;* promise before a battle); 1 K. 11:38 (*ʿim;* promise of the God of Israel [v. 31] to those who obey, from the mouth of the prophets, in which the reference back to David is important); Isa. 41:10 (*ʿim;* promise of salvation to the servant, Israel);[19] 43:2,5 (is v. 5a an addition?—*ʾeth* occurs twice here in oracles of salvation which state that the exiles who return to Palestine will have an escort on the way); Jer. 1:8 (cf. 1:19; 15:20, *ʾeth;* also Ex. 3:12; Jgs. 6:12; promise connected with the summons to go and send, connected with war terminology, v. 16; assurance of salvation as a promise that Yahweh will be with Israel); Jer. 30:11 (*ʾeth;* cf. 46:28; promise of salvation to Israel); 42:11 (*ʾeth;* promise of Yahweh through Jeremiah to the Jews who were about to leave Babylon); Mic. 6:8 (*ʿim;* Yahweh wants man to "walk with him" attentively!); Hag. 1:13 (cf. 2:4f., *ʾeth;* promise of help to the people in a time of distress); Zec. 10:5 (*ʿim;* promise of help for the battle in which Yahweh's flock is about to engage; cf. Ezk. 34:30, which is an addition; *ʿim*).

In these passages, no distinction can be made between *ʾeth* (12 times) and *ʿim* (18 times), either on the basis of content or of persons speaking or persons addressed. No temporal distinction is possible either (cf. Hag. with Zec.; Deutero-Isaiah has both prepositions; Jer. only *ʾeth;* J only *ʿim,* but in Gen. 26:24 *ʾeth;* E has both prepositions),[20] even if the use of *ʿim* is somewhat predominant. The formula using *ʾeth* and *ʿim* has no exclusive connection with cult places, but the oldest texts use it mainly as a promise that Yahweh will be with the people or an individual before and during journeys (but cf. Mic. 6:8; Isa. 43:2). What is meant here is that Israel is accompanied by God, who also fights for his own on their journey. The Yahweh war is one concretizing aspect of God's presence, and not the only *Sitz im Leben* of this formula.[21] By means of a transposition of motifs, this formula later becomes a general promise of divine help, and as such also enters into the prophetic oracle of salvation; but even after this transposition the concrete primitive situation of the road and of war is often apparent (Isa. 43:2,5; Jer. 1:19; 15:20; Zec. 10:5; Ch.). There is no promise that the deity will be with David (2 S. 7:3 is assertive, and the tense cannot be determined definitely), and thus *ʿim* is not fundamental to the concept of the Davidic covenant.[22] It should also be observed that the expression *hayah ʾeth (ʿim),* "to be with," calls to mind the divine name Yahweh or is even used to explain its meaning. In this connection, additional passages from the OT using *ʾeth* and *ʿim* can be cited which describe Yahweh as a God who leads, accompanies, goes with, and fights

---

[18] For a discussion of the translation and context of Jgs. 6:12, see Preuss, 142f., n. 11 and 11a.

[19] For a more detailed study of this passage, cf. Preuss, 143, n. 12.

[20] See below.

[21] However, cf. further H. W. Wolff.

[22] Cf. Preuss, 145, with the literature cited there, and Kilian, 57f.

Copyrighted material

can logically be connected with each other. Passages expressing the hope that God will be with his people in the future, just as he had been with the fathers or had performed his saving deeds (Dt. 20:1!) in the past, are important (Josh. 1:17; 14:12; Jgs. 6:13; 1 S. 20:13; 1 K. 1:37; 8:57; cf. 1 S. 3:19). We also encounter the general use of this formula expressing help in passages that connect it with the idea of protection in war or on a journey (Ex. 18:19f.; 2 S. 14:17; 1 S. 20:13; etc.).

4. *In the Affirmative Use.* In contrast to the 30 passages containing promises from the mouth of God that he would be with his people, and to the 33 passages containing promises or wishes from the mouth of man, there are 41 passages in the OT in which one man or several affirm that Yahweh (or God) was "with him, thee, me, them, you, us." These passages show that from the promises of God an assurance had developed in Israel as self-confidence that Yahweh would be "with" his people as he was with the individual godly person (Am. 5:14!). E.g., P uses the expression "to walk with God" (only in Gen. 5:24 and 6:9) to express the intimate communion between man and God (cf. Ps. 73:23; Mic. 6:8), but we do not find it in P after the story of the flood; now Abraham merely walks "before" God (Gen. 17:1, P). [24]

Actually, the first example of the affirmative use of the formula using *ʾeth* or *ʿim* is in Gen. 21:20 (*ʾeth,* E). God was with Ishmael in the wilderness: without any additional explanation, this formula could already have been mentioned casually as a part of familiar tradition, as a Bedouin motif. [25] 21:22 (*ʿim,* E) and 26:28 (*ʿim,* J) reflect similar situations: 21:22 is unique in that it states that God was with Abraham, whereas such a statement is common in the stories of Isaac and Jacob. Also, J does not speak of Yahweh being with Abraham. 31:5 (*ʿim,* E; cf. v. 3) states that the God of his father was with Jacob as he went on his way; cf. 35:3 (*ʿim,* E). In 39:2,3,21,23, the narrator expresses his opinion that Yahweh was with (*ʾeth,* J) Joseph, i.e., he protected and accompanied him, and for this reason he was successful. In Nu. 23:21, even Balaam has to admit that Yahweh was with (*ʿim,* E) Israel. A fundamental concept in Deuteronomy is that Yahweh alone was with his people during their wandering in the wilderness, and that he alone led them and protected them (Dt. 2:7; 32:12, *ʿim*). Yahweh was with Joshua at the conquest of Jericho (Josh. 6:27, *ʾeth*); he was also with Judah and the house of Joseph in their battles to conquer portions of the land of Canaan (Jgs. 1:19, *ʾeth,* J?; 1:22, *ʿim*). He was with the different judges of Israel, who fought for Israel against their enemies (Jgs. 2:18, *ʿim;* Deuteronomistic).

The books of Samuel state that Yahweh was with Samuel and thus fulfilled his promises (1 S. 3:19, *ʿim*). Saul was told how he would know that God was with him (10:7, *ʿim*). An Israelite's *"kalokagathía"* [26] (nobility of character) was

---

[24] Richter thinks the affirmative use is the original use of the formula with *ʾeth* or *ʿim* expressing help.

[25] So R. Kilian, *Die vorpriesterlichen Abrahamsüberlieferungen literarkritisch und traditionsgeschichtlich untersucht. BBB,* 24 (1966), 237; from the pre-Yahwistic original stratum (*Grundschicht*), so *idem,* 241-43, 247.

[26] Von Rad.

Copyrighted material

one indication that Yahweh was "with him," as can be seen in the case of David (16:18; 18:14, *ʿim;* cf. 18:12,28, *ʿim;* 2 S. 5:10; 1 Ch. 11:9; 2 S. 7:3,9; 1 Ch. 17:2, always *ʿim*). Here the presence of Yahweh always means "under his help," and in connection with this also (!) "under his blessing," although this is not its primary meaning from a traditio-historical point in view.[27] Yahweh was also with Hezekiah in his conquests (2 K. 18:7, *ʿim*). In the opinion of the Chronicler, he was also with Solomon (and thus Solomon became exceedingly great, 2 Ch. 1:1, *ʿim*), Jehoshaphat (17:3, *ʿim,* because he walked in the ways of his father [David? cf. *BHK*]), and Asa (15:9, when the Israelites see this, many desert to him, cf. Zec. 8:23). Elsewhere the Chronicler usually states that Yahweh was with a group of people, i.e., with Israel as a people (1 Ch. 22:18, *ʿim;* 2 Ch. 13:12; 15:2 [twice with *ʿim* as a key word]; this verse could also be understood as a prophetic promise). In his trials, Jeremiah is certain that Yahweh is with him as his champion (20:11; note the war figures), and the same is true of the worshipper in Ps. 23 (v. 4, *ʿim:* in direct address to the "shepherd," Yahweh). However, Job (29:5) can look back only plaintively to the time when Yahweh was with him and he was surrounded with divine help and blessing (cf. also 27:13). According to Zec. 8:23, heathen join themselves to the Jews when and where they see that God is with the Jews, as Yahweh Sebaoth himself says. Only in Ps. 91:15 do we encounter an *ʿimmo ʾanokhi,* "I will be with him," as a quotation from an oracle received by the worshipper. But since this encouragement could hardly be in the 3rd person, there are both textual and contextual questions about it. Finally, a group, viz., the community of the city of God, says that Yahweh Sebaoth is "with us" (*ʿimmanu,* Ps. 46:8,12[7,11]; also in v. 4[3]?), which is an expression of certainty. Isa. 8:10 as well (also 8:8?) is illuminated from this background.[28]

In these passages where the affirmative use of the formula with *ʾeth* and *ʿim* occurs, it is clear that *ʿim* (34 times) is found much more frequently than *ʾeth* (7 times), and thus the tendency to use *ʿim* exclusively is especially evident (Chronicles uses only *ʿim*). The affirmative use of this formula also betrays a connection with journeys, nomadic life, accompaniment by the deity, and battles fought with his help (Gen. 21:20; 26:28; 31:5; 35:3; Nu. 23:21; Dt. 2:7; 32:12; Josh. 6:27; Jgs. 1:19; 2:18; 2 S. 7:9; 2 K. 18:7; 1 Ch. 22:18; 2 Ch. 13:12; Ps. 23:4; 46:8,12[7,11]; and even Zec. 8:23). This formula is used to express the general help of Yahweh in the Joseph story, the Davidic narratives, and in certain texts in Chronicles.

The promises of God connect the assurance of God's presence to a group only ten times (*ʾeth:* Isa. 43:2,5; Jer. 30:11; 42:11; 46:28; Hag. 1:13f.; 2:4; *ʿim:* Josh. 7:12; Isa. 41:10; Zec. 10:5). Human wishes and promises with the assurance of God's presence have a group in mind in 13 passages (*ʾeth:* Josh. 14:12; Ps. 67:2 [1]–the text of these two verses is uncertain; *ʿim:* Ex. 10:10; Nu. 14:43; Dt. 20:1, 3f.; 31:6; 1 K. 8:57; 2 Ch. 19:11; 20:17; 25:7; 32:8; 36:23). This survey shows

---

[27] Cf. Preuss, 149, n. 11a; 154, n. 56; on "presence" as "blessing," cf. G. Wehmeier, *Der Segen im AT* (1970), 136, 170, 203f.

[28] See below, III.

Copyrighted material

oracle of salvation, but even here its original concreteness is still preserved or reflected. The Israel that now was to receive rest does not cast off its nomadic thought and faith categories, but remolds them. Various words pertaining to "journey" and "way" are part of the affirmative categories of Israel's history. Texts that speak of general divine guidance represent a change from expressing Yahweh's leadership in specific terms of a journey or the way from A to B (cf. the Joseph Novella and the Succession Narrative). Thus *ʿim* is not a word that is peculiar to the Davidic Covenant, but has already become stereotyped when it is used in this covenant. [33]

Sometimes, when the formula using *ʾeth* or *ʿim* appears in the postexilic period in Chronicles, the presence of Yahweh with his people is connected with the Yahweh war, as it was in the early period. The OT also states that those who return from the exile will travel with the promise that Yahweh will be with them again in their exodus from Babylon. But here also, of course, we encounter the formula using *ʾeth* or *ʿim* in expressions that had already become stereotyped earlier, so that Yahweh is said to be "with" him who walks in his way. Finally, this formula becomes an element in a greeting (2 Ch. 19:6; Ruth 2:4), but it constantly remains connected with history, and does not become a cultic formula in the postexilic period.

Accordingly, the concept of "the presence of Yahweh with his own," which comes from a typically nomadic background, also exhibits the personal character of the Yahweh faith, in which Yahweh was believed to be a God who accompanied, led, protected, and fought for his people. The statement "Yahweh in our midst" is well adapted to this concept of faith (cf. Gen. 46:4; Ex. 3:8,17; 13:17,21; 14:19; 23:20ff.; 33:2f.,5,15f.; 34:5,9f.; Lev. 26:13; Nu. 14:42; Dt. 1:30, 42; 4:37; 20:1,4; 26:8; 31:6,8; 32:12; Jgs. 4:14; 5:13; Isa. 58:11; 63:12f.; Mic. 3:11; Ps. 24:7ff.; 106:9). From the concrete idea of the way and of the journey, in which the traveller was accompanied by Yahweh, came the concept of history as a journey with him, as guidance history; from the promise that Yahweh would accompany his people, a formula of help; and from the nomadic journey, the earthly pilgrimage. This proved to be a good preparation for the references to the presence of God with his people, which frequently were expanded from the viewpoint of salvation history. [34] Various words pertaining to the way, such as "to go," "to guide," "to lead," "to follow," "shepherd and sheep," etc., remain constant in the OT (cf. Am. 9:7; Jer. 2:2,5; etc.), and they are also important in the Qumran literature and the NT. The belief in the presence of God with his people (from Ex. 3 on) is a fundamental component of the concept of salvation history, and in turn eschatology is a function of this belief in God and of historical events. Yahweh's existence, like his name, is frequently manifested by his active presence, i.e., by his works. [35] This sort of OT faith was still active in the

---

[33] Cf. above under II.3 on 2 S. 7:3, and also Preuss, 156, n. 65.

[34] Cf. under II.3 and 4. On history as a journey with Yahweh, cf. H. D. Preuss, *Jahweglaube und Zukunftserwartung* (1968), 71ff.; and *ZAW*, 80, 157f., 171-73 with literature; further F. L. Hossfeld, *Studien zur Theologie des Weges im AT* (diss., Trier, 1967).

[35] Examples in Preuss, 159.

Material com direitos autorais

the ancient war name, which later (through the ark?), especially in connection with Jerusalem, became the title of Yahweh, who reveals his power in war (1 S. 4:4,6f.; 2 S. 6:2,18; 7:27; Ps. 24; Isa. 6; 1 S. 17:45). An affirmation about Yahweh, which at one time was at home in Shiloh (Sebaoth), was combined with an affirmation about him from Bethel (the God of Jacob) at Jerusalem, and these were attached to Yahweh about the same time that ancient mythical traditions of the Jebusites coming from pre-Davidic Jerusalem were being transferred to him (cf. Ps. 46:5[4]: *'elyon!*).[41] This Judean adaptation of earlier Jebusite city traditions (cf. Gen. 14:18-20), which led to a mythicizing of the Yahweh war traditions that are embraced by the title "Yahweh Sebaoth,"[42] may also explain why *'el,* "God," no longer stands in the Song of Zion in Ps. 46:8,12[7,11], but appears once again in Isa. 8:8,10 (cf. 7:14). When Isaiah uses *'el* in these passages, we must assume that he is adapting earlier traditions about the city of God or the mountain of God to his own Zion theology, which, indeed, he demythologizes and historicizes: Yahweh's presence in Zion, his being "in the midst of" his Zion community, being "with" it, and fighting for it, creates assurance and hope. Now it is the invasion of the nations upon Zion that will be shattered, but no longer the floods of chaos.

'immanu (here we must disregard the passages in the OT that use *'eth*) is used as a prayer and/or a wish in Jgs. 6:13; 1 K. 8:57; and 2 Ch. 32:8; and as an affirmative statement in 2 Ch. 13:12 (in a war setting! cf. Ps. 46:8,12[7,11]; Isa. 8:10) and 15:2 (as *'immakhem;* or rather a human promise? with a word play: *'immakhem–'immo,* "with you"–"with him"), where the meaning recalls Isa. 7:9. 2 S. 5:10; 1 Ch. 11:9; and 17:8 state that it is "Yahweh Sebaoth" who was "with" David (!). Zec. 10:3 says that Yahweh Sebaoth is over his people.

Isa. 8:9f. (cf. 8:8 and 8:5-8) should also be classified with these passages, and especially with the phrase in Ps. 46:(4),8,12([3],7,11). The Assyrian invasion will have no success against the city of God, since El is with her (8:10), so say her inhabitants ("us"). God is present in her midst and actively fights for her (the dread caused by God!). The context of vv. 9f.[43] must not be regarded as an insertion, but can well be understood (in light of other passages in chaps. 7f.) as Isaiah's word of comfort to the inhabitants of Zion, whom he considers to be the "remnant."[44] Consequently, *'immanu 'el* is not to be interpreted as a name in this passage as it is in 7:14. We have already mentioned Isa. 8:5-8 several times in connection with Ps. 46, because the affirmation of assurance and similar figures play a dominant role in both passages. In Isa. 8:8, *'immanu 'el* has even been reduced to a direct address, i.e., to a well-known stereotyped technical term, which would cause the reader of this word (6:1–9:6[6:1–9:7]) to recall 7:14, and

---

[41] The close connection between the God of Jacob and Yahweh's "presence" with his people has already been mentioned in II.5.

[42] Cf. H.-P. Müller, 39-49.

[43] For a good treatment of this passage, cf. M. Saebø, "Zur Traditionsgeschichte von Jes 8,9-10," *ZAW*, 76 (1964), 132-144.

[44] See below.

Material com direitos autorais

course, to the period of the Syro-Ephraimitic war (7:3!); but this fits the historical situation of chaps. 7f., and 9:5f.(6f.) is particularly significant for this "us," to whom the future is given.[55] Isaiah also expects a new Davidide and a renewed kingdom for the remnant community as a nucleus of the genuine people of God (cf. 9:1,5f.[2,6f.]; 11:1). In Isaiah, the concept of the remnant and the hope in the renewed house of David are also connected historically during a certain era of his prophecy.[56]

(5) The polar character of the sign to Ahaz, which must be interpreted both as a threat to the king and as a promise of salvation through the "presence" of God with his people, cannot be refuted by the argument that the introductory *lakhen* in v. 14 can stand only before threats (it introduces hope oracles in Ex. 6:6; Nu. 25:12; in prophetic texts such as 2 K. 19:32 par.; 22:20; Isa. 51:21; 53:12; 61:7; Jer. 15:19; 16:14; cf. 23:7; 32:36; Ezk. 11:17; 12:28; 36:7f.,22; 37:12; 39:25; Hos. 2:16[14]; Mic. 5:2[3]!; and in Isa. 10:24 [secondary]; 29:22 [genuine?]; 28:16). Isa. 7:16 also has a promissory character;[57] the possible ambiguity of "milk and honey" (v. 15? or is this rather a gloss?; cf. v. 22, where line a also seems to be an insertion) could support the polar character of this passage.[58]

Thus the child of Isa. 7 brings and means judgment for Ahaz, but the saving presence of God for those who believe.

Preuss

[55] H. W. Wolff, *Frieden ohne Ende* (1962), 70, 72.

[56] Cf. S. Herrmann, *Die prophetischen Heilserwartungen im AT* (1965), 139f., who refers to elements of the Davidic royal ritual in 1 K. 3:5ff. in interpreting Isa. 7:15f.; his view has been criticized recently by U. Stegemann, "Der Restgedanke bei Isaias," *BZ*, N.F. 13 (1969), 161-186; on Isa. 7, 184f.

[57] Contra, e.g., Kilian, who considers v. 16c to be an addition.

[58] Cf. further H. W. Wolff, *Frieden ohne Ende*, 44f.; Rehm, 66-73; Kilian, 37-43.

בְּאֵר *beʾēr*; בּוֹר *bôr*

Contents: I. Meaning and Etymology. II. 1. Use and Technology; 2. a. In Place Names; b. In Personal Names. III. Figurative and Religious Meanings.

I. Meaning and Etymology. In contrast to a spring (→ עַיִן *ʿayin*), in which underground water comes forth in a natural way, the well (*beʾer*) is an artificial device in which underground water is obtained by technological means (cf. Gen. 26:19, "a well of living water"). The Ugar. *bʾr*, Aram. *byrʾ* or *bʾrʾ*, Syr. *bīrā*

beʾēr. C. Braunlich, "The Well in Ancient Arabia," *Islamica*, I (1924/25), 41-76, 288-343, 454-528; B. Buffet-R. Evrard, *L'eau potable à travers les âges* (Liége, 1950); G. Dalman, *AuS*, VI, 273-76; T. J. Jones, *Quelle, Brunnen und Zisterne im AT* (1928); R. Patai, "The 'Control of Rain' in Ancient Palestine," *HUCA*, 14 (1939), 251-286; B. Rein, *Der Brunnen im Volksleben* (1912); Ph. Reymond, "L'eau, sa vie et sa signification dans l'AT," *SVT*, 6 (1958), 245-255, with literature.

Copyrighted material

or *bērā,* and Arab. *bīr* (cf. *ba'ara,* "to dig a well")[1] have the same meaning.

The word *bor,* "cistern,"[2] probably belongs to the same root as *be'er,* and represents a variant in vocalization (cf. Akk. *būru, būrtu,* with the same meaning).

II. 1. *Use and Technology.* The digging and operation of a well presuppose several technological and socio-economic conditions: procuring tools to dig out or to break through (*karah, chatsebh, chaphar,* cf. Jer. 2:13)[3] the soil and rocks, and material to help support the walls of the well. Often a well is the beginning of a human settlement; the digging of the well requires general solidarity, especially in the wilderness. The best illustration of this is the ancient work song in Nu. 21:17f., which has been preserved in connection with a Transjordanian stronghold called Beer (v. 16),[4] and in which the initiative for this important project is said to belong to the leaders of the people. This song by no means excludes echoes of an exorcism directed to the spirit of the spring.[5] This may be compared to the expression common among the Transjordanian Arabs: "The sheik dug this well."[6]

2. a. *In Place Names.* The frequency of geographical names associated with wells or cisterns may easily be explained by the role these played as gathering points and places people must pass by of necessity (cf. Gen. 29). The Hebrew word for "well" (*be'er*) appears in the following place names: Beer, "the well" (Nu. 21:16; Jgs. 9:21); and Beeroth, "the wells" (Josh. 9:17; 18:25; 2 S. 4:2; Ezr. 2:25; Neh. 7:29; gentilic in 2 S. 4:2ff.; 1 Ch. 11:39), which is usually identified with the modern el-Bireh, about 7 kilometers northeast of Gibeon, although the modern name is more closely connected with the Aram. *birah,* "stronghold."[7] A well can be named after the vegetation surrounding it, e.g., Beer-elim, "well of the terebinths" (Isa. 15:8), after ancient battles fought near it, as Beer-esek or Beer-sitnah, "well of the conflict" (Gen. 26:20-22), or ironically Beer-rehoboth, "well of the width." The vital role of wells, especially in a wilderness area, is emphasized by these names. Watering places are reserved exclusively for the clan or tribe (cf. Gen. 21:25; Dt. 10:6, "the well of the sons of Jaakan").

Josh. 15 describes the boundaries between the tribal territories, which sometimes are determined by a watercourse, a spring, or a well (esp. vv. 7,9; cf. the

---

1 *KBL*[3], 102.

2 Cf. *br* in the Mesha Inscription, *KAI,* 181.24; 2 S. 23:15,16,20 written בֹּאר *bō'r;* see below, III.

3 Jones, 8ff.; Reymond, 131-152.

4 See Eissfeldt, *The OT* (trans. 1965), 88.

5 Cf. A. Lods, *Histoire de la littérature hébraïque* (1950), 41-43, who gives a complete analysis of the passage.

6 On technological questions, types of wells and cisterns, etc., see Jones, 4-37; Dalman, *AuS,* VI, 273-76; VII, 47, 89; Reymond, 131ff. Cf. also L. Köhler, "Ein hebr.-arab. Brunnen-Terminus," *ZDPV,* 60 (1937), 135-39, on *'ābhēl,* "covered well," from which a place name has probably been derived, cf. Gen. 29:2.

7 On this problem, cf. *BRL,* 193-97; M. Weippert, *The Settlement of the Israelite Tribes in Palestine. SBT,* 21 (trans. 1971), 14, n. 30; J. A. Soggin, *Joshua. OTL* (trans. 1972), 115.

Copyrighted material

37:16) denotes the entrance into → שאול *she'ôl,* "Sheol" (Isa. 14:15; Ezk. 32:23). Therefore, "the dead" are called *yoredhe bhor,* "those who go down to the pit" (Isa. 38:18; Ezk. 26:20; Ps. 28:1; etc.); *be'er* has a similar meaning in Ps. 69:16 (Eng. v. 15); 55:24(23); cf. Rev. 9:1ff.

In the sexual realm, *be'er* is used as a figure for a woman giving birth to a child (Lev. 20:18; Isa. 51:1–mother earth?), or a sweetheart and wife (Cant. 4:15; Prov. 5:15; Eccl. 12:6).

Further, the well is a symbol of wisdom as a place of deepening thoughts (cf. Dt. 1:5), and as a source of blessing through the discovery of "water" (Prov. 16:22; Sir. 1:5; Bar. 3:12). On the other hand, a cistern appears occasionally as an expression for disappointment and destruction (Jer. 2:13; [18] cf. Nah. 2:9 [8]), and, even when it performs its function, for the wickedness of Jerusalem (Jer. 6:7).

The religious significance of *be'er,* which had already been established by the ancient topographical traditions, [19] is also expressed in texts like Isa. 51:1, where Yahweh, as "the well of Judah," [20] is protector and giver of life and of security. In his omnipotence, he cleft open wells in the wilderness (Ps. 74:15) and hewed out cisterns in the promised land (Dt. 6:11). The God of Israel is the one who gives the "living water" (→ מים *mayim,* Jn. 4:14; Rev. 21:6). Using this metaphor, Jeremiah reproves his people because they have forsaken the fountain of living water, and hewed out broken cisterns that can hold no water (Jer. 2:13). Idols are as useless as broken cisterns compared with a good fountain which gives fresh water.

Heintz

---

18 See below.
19 See above, II.2.a.
20 Cf. Reymond, 160f.

בָּבֶל *bābhel*

Contents: I. The Name. II. The Tower. III. Babylon in the Prophets.

I. The Name. The name *babhel,* "Babylon," which corresponds to the Akk. *Bābili/u,* is explained in Gen. 11:9 by popular etymology as related to the verb *balal,* "to mix," "to confuse," and is connected with the confusion of tongues.[1] The Babylonians understood it as *Bāb-ili,* "gate of God" (Sum. *ka-dingir-ra*), but this seems to be a learned interpretation. This name, whose original form

---

bābhel. W. Andrae, "Der babylonische Turm," *MDOG,* 71 (1932), 1-11; S. Erlandsson, *The Burden of Babylon* (Lund, 1970); M.-L. Henry, *Glaubenskrise und Glaubensbewährung in den Dichtungen der Jesaja-apokalypse. BWANT,* 5/6 (1967); J. Lindblom, *Die Jesaja-Apokalypse. LUÅ,* 34/3 (Lund, 1938); A. Parrot, *La tour de Babel* (Paris, 1954); W. von Soden, "Etemenanki und die Erzählung vom Turmbau zu Babel," *UF,* 3 (1971), 253-263; E. Unger, *Babylon, die heilige Stadt* (1931); L. H. Vincent, "De la tour de Babel au temple," *RB,* 53 (1946), 403-440.

1 See below.

Copyrighted material

בֶּגֶד *beghedh*, "clothing" → לבשׁ *lbš*

בָּגַד *bāghadh*; בֶּגֶד *beghedh*

Contents: I. Occurrences, Meaning. II. Range of Usage: 1. Marriage; 2. Covenant; 3. Created Order; 4. Human Agreements.

I. Occurrences, Meaning. The verb *baghadh* occurs 43 times in the OT, and the noun *beghedh* occurs twice. The verb appears only 3 times in the historical books (Ex. 21:8; Jgs. 9:23; 1 S. 14:33). We encounter this word most frequently in the prophetic literature. It occurs 7 times in Jer., 5 times in Mal., and twice each in Hos. and Hab. (Zeph. 3:4 has the form *boghedhoth* with the abstract meaning "faithlessness"). It is found in Isa. 21:2; 24:16; 33:1; and 48:8, in all of which it appears in paronomastic constructions. The verb also occurs in the poetic literature: 9 times in Prov., 5 times in Pss., and once each in Job and Lamentations.

The verb expresses the unstable relationship of man to an existing established regulation, and can be translated "to act faithlessly (treacherously)." It is used when the OT writer wants to say that a man does not honor an agreement, or commits adultery, or breaks a covenant or some other ordinance given by God. The treacherous acts of man stand in contrast to Yahweh's faithfulness to his covenant and trustworthiness (*chesedh ve'emeth*). Thus *baghadh*, "to act treacherously," has primarily a religious function. As a rule, the object of this verb is God. But God-given ordinances also include a man's relationship to his fellow man, and thus occasionally man is also the object of a treacherous act. Sometimes *baghadh* is used to denote the violation of a purely human ordinance. König and others conjecture that this root is connected with *beghedh*, "clothing." In this case, the original meaning of the verb would have been "to clothe, to cover, to veil"; however, this would be weaker than the transferred figurative meaning, "to behave secretively, to do something veiled, to deceive," and thus "to act faithlessly (treacherously)." But this verb occurs in South Arabic with the meaning "to deceive," which can be traced back to two different roots.

II. Range of Usage.

1. *Marriage. baghadh* can be used in connection with faithlessness in marriage, violating a promise, and deserting one's legal partner and establishing a relationship with someone else. The object of faithlessness can be the wife (Ex. 21:8) or the husband (Jer. 3:20). But usually the marriage symbolism in the prophetic texts describes the relationship of the people of Israel or Judah to Yahweh. Here God is the object of the faithless act. In Jer. 9:1 (Eng. v. 2), the people of Judah are called *boghedhim*, "treacherous," which is used in parallelism with *mena'aphim*, "adulterers." In vv. 2ff.(3ff.), additional accusations are added to this indictment which indicate more precisely the nature of their faithlessness

Éléments sous droits d'auteur

seed of God" (a godly offspring, *zera' 'elohim,* v. 15). Not unexpectedly, the verb *baghadh* also occurs in Hosea. In Hos. 6:7, the expression *baghedhu bhi,* "they dealt faithlessly with me," is used in connection with the people's transgression (*'abhar*) of the covenant. No one manifests faithfulness; and the love (*chesedh*) of the people is compared with a morning cloud and with the dew that goes early away (v. 4), graphic figures for the unreliability of man. In 5:7, the faithless acts of the people against Yahweh are compared with the birth of illegitimate children (*banim zarim;* cf. Mal. 2:15).

3. *Created Order.* In Proverbs, the verb *baghadh* is used more generally in speaking of man's appeal to the created order. The idea is that one does not wish to continue in and to respect the prevailing conditions and ordinances in the situation in which he has been placed. Therefore, frequently the word *boghedhim,* "treacherous," alternates with → רשעים *reshā'îm,* "wicked," e.g., in Prov. 2:22; 11:6f.; 21:18. The *boghedhim* are contrasted with those who live in harmony with the divine order. In Prov. 2:22 *resha'im,* "wicked," and *boghedhim,* "treacherous," stand in contrast to → ישרים *yeshārîm,* "upright," and → תמימים *temimim,* "men of integrity," and the situation is similar in 11:3. Ps. 25:3 and 59:6(5) speak of the judgment upon the treacherous (*boghedhim*). Ps. 73:15 says that the denial of divine justice is faithlessness and treachery against the members of the people of God. Ps. 59:6(5) contains the remarkable expression *boghedhe 'aven,* "those who treacherously plot evil," which evidently is a fusion of the synonymous expressions *po'ale 'aven,* "evildoers, workers of iniquity," and *boghedhim,* "treacherous." In Job 6:15, *baghadh* is used to denote the treacherous acts of men against one another. One thing that is presupposed in trustworthiness and faithfulness is a God-fearing life in communion with the God who provides for the order in the world. Therefore, Job states that the reason for treachery among men is the abandonment (*'azabh*) of the fear of God (v. 14).

With the exception of Isa. 48:8, the verb *baghadh* is used in the book of Isaiah in a way that does not seem to correspond to that which has been suggested above. Among other things, this has led *GesB* to give a special meaning for the verb *baghadh* in Isa. 21:2; 24:16; and 33:1, viz., "to plunder." But this meaning seems rash, and has been rejected by König and others. In Isa. 24:16, the emphatic phrase *beghedh boghedhim baghadhu,* "the treacherous deal treacherously, the treacherous deal very treacherously," stands in a context (24:1-23) in which it is stated that the inhabitants of the earth have broken "the everlasting covenant" (v. 5). Evidently, this refers to the covenant with Noah (Gen. 9:9). To break this covenant, to sin against God's order for man in general, leads to chaos. Thus the term *boghedhim* here has the same meaning as it does in Proverbs, and is synonymous with *resha'im,* "wicked." [1]

4. *Human Agreements. baghadh* is also used in speaking of a breach in human agreements and treaties. Thus, this verb is used in Jgs. 9:23 to denote that the men of Shechem were no longer content to submit themselves to the

[1] On Isa. 21:2 and 33:1, see II.4.

Éléments sous droits d'auteur

authority of Abimelech. They "dealt treacherously" with the ordinances of Abimelech. Here *baghadh* is synonymous with "rebel, revolt." In Lam. 1:2 we again encounter the marriage symbolism, but here the verb *baghadh* is used to denote the treachery of one sweetheart to another. Similarly, in Isa. 33:1 this verb describes the relationship of the subject to certain regulations. The tyrant deals treacherously with human regulations; he does not respect ratified covenants (*hepher berith*, "covenants are broken," v. 8). It is quite probable that here *baghadh* includes the idea that the tyrant went beyond the limitations God had allowed him (cf. Isa. 10:7ff.). The term *habboghedh* in Isa. 21:2 can be explained in a similar way. The destructions "of the treacherous one" testify to the rebellion against and lack of respect for ordinances and agreements.

In the MT of Hab. 2:5 we find the words *hayyayin boghedh*. This must refer to the power of wine, which causes a man to act abnormally (chaotically), arrogantly, and rebelliously. 1QpHab 8:3 reads *hon*, "riches," instead of *hayyayin*, "(the) wine." In this case, the appositional *boghedh* refers to the danger that riches might induce a man to act deceitfully and treacherously against his fellow men.

Erlandsson

בָּדָד *bādhādh*; בַּד *badh*; בְּדַד *bādhadh*

Contents: I. Occurrences, Meaning, Etymology: 1. Outside the OT; 2. In the OT. II. 1. Isolation of Human Communities; 2. Isolation of Individuals; 3. Isolation of God. III. Theological Appraisal of Isolation.

I. Occurrences, Meaning, Etymology.

1. *Outside the OT*. The verb *bdd* appears in Akkadian, Arabic, and Tigriñaic,[1] and possibly also in Ugaritic.[2] The nouns *badd* and *budd*, which are derived from this root, occur in Arabic. In Akkadian in the D stem the verb means "to squander"; in Arabic, "to separate"; in Tigriñaic, "to be omitted"; and in Ugaritic Aistleitner conjectures that it means "to take away" (?). The Arab. nouns *budd* and *badd* are translated "separation," "part of something," and "rafter."

2. *In the OT*. Biblical Hebrew and Middle Hebrew also contain the root *bdd*. However, the verb occurs in the OT only in the qal active participle, and

---

bādhādh. G. Johannes, *Unvergleichlichkeitsformulierungen im AT* (diss., Mainz, 1966), cf. *ZAW*, 81 (1969), 421f.; C. J. Labuschagne, *The Incomparability of Yahweh in the OT* (1966); H. Seidel, *Das Erlebnis der Einsamkeit im AT. Theologische Arbeiten*, 29 (1969).

1 *KBL*³.

2 Aistleitner, *WUS*, No. 496.

Éléments sous droits d'auteur

that only three times. The noun *badh* I is found only two or three times, but it appears in the combination *lebhadh* (which also occurs in Middle Heb. and Samaritan) approximately 146 times. The other noun **badh* II, which is also attested in Middle Hebrew and Jewish Aramaic, is found 41 times in all in the OT. Also the noun *badhadh* appears 11 times in Biblical Hebrew. These statistics indicate the priority of the nominal aspect of the root *bdd* over the verbal. *badh* I means "part, piece." According to Ex. 30:34, perfumes were to be produced from different kinds of fragrant substances, "an equal part of each" (*badh bebhadh*). Bardtke and Maier [3] translate this expression in a similar way in 1QS 4:16,25. [4] In Job 18:13, *badde* (pl. const. of *badh*), which has a genitival relationship with *'oro,* "his skin," means the "parts" or "pieces" of the skin (and absolutely the "parts" or "members" of the body) consumed by leprosy.

Because of this different meaning of *badh,* most commentators emend the text of Job 18:13a. [5] In Job 41:4 (Eng. v. 12), it is disputed whether *baddav* means "his members (limbs)" or (classifying this word under **badh* IV) "his idle talk (prattle)," [6] or whether to emend the MT. [7] In Am. 3:12, Rabinowitz reads *ubhadh meshoq 'ares,* "and of a piece out of the leg of a bed." [8]

**badh* II means both "poles used for carrying" different pieces of cultic furniture (Ex. 25:14f.,27f.; 27:6f.; etc.) and the "shoots (branches)" of the vine (Ezk. 17:6; 19:14). The *lebhadh* listed in the lexicons under *badh I* means as an adverb "alone, by itself," and as a preposition (always in connection with a *min* following it) "besides," "with the exception of," "apart from." The ptcp. *bodhedh* and the noun *badhadh,* which originally was used adverbially, are translated "solitarily," "alone."

This survey indicates that without exception these words must have been derived from a root common to them all, *bdd,* whose original meaning was "to separate, to isolate," a meaning still preserved most clearly in Arabic. Therefore, the root *bdd* (and its derivatives), as a term for isolation, deserves special consideration, since it seems to be a strange peculiarity in OT linguistic usage.

II. 1. *Isolation of Human Communities.* a. The OT repeatedly speaks of an isolation of human communities. In the third song of Balaam we read: "Lo, a people dwelling alone (*lebhadhadh yishkon*)/ and not reckoning itself among the nations!" (Nu. 23:9; E). The very next line in v. 10 extols the innumerable throng of Israel. The concluding portion of the "psalm" in the Blessing of Moses (Dt. 33), which provides the framework for the statements concerning the tribes, sounds very similar. After vv. 26,27a have declared the incomparability of the God of Israel and v. 27b has related the expulsion and destruction of Israel's enemies, v. 28 continues: "So Israel dwelt in safety (*yishkon betach*),/ the foun-

---

[3] H. Bardtke, *Die Handschriftenfunde am Toten Meer,* I (²1953), 92; and J. Maier, *Die Texte vom Toten Meer,* I (1960), 28f.

[4] Contra P. Wernberg-Møller, *The Manual of Discipline* (1957), 84: "separately."

[5] Fohrer, *KAT,* XVI, 298.

[6] Weiser, *ATD,* XIII, 253; Hölscher, *HAT,* 17 (²1952), 96; cf. *KBL*³.

[7] So Fohrer, *KAT,* XVI, 257.

[8] J. Rabinowitz, "The Crux at Amos 3,12," *VT,* 11 (1961), 228-231.

b. *badhadh* has another nuance of meaning in Mic. 7:14, as well as in Isa. 27:10 and Lam. 1:1. Mic. 7:14 belongs to an oracle most commentators deny to the prophet Micah and date in the postexilic or even late postexilic period. This oracle is in the form of a popular lament, [15] and its author(s) asks God to restore to the people of Israel the regions of the land east of Jordan which had been lost to them in the catastrophe of 586 B.C. In this context, v. 14 describes the present situation in these words: "'who' dwell alone (*shokhene lebhadhadh*)/ in a forest in the midst of a garden land." To be sure, here also *lebhadhadh* is construed with *shakhan,* "to dwell," but the positive meaning has been transformed into the negative. From the people's security which resulted from dwelling alone has come a deplorable solitude, which is associated with the idea of the forest (*ya'ar*).

Isa. 27:10 and Lam. 1:1, which refer to the city of Jerusalem and personify it, sound similar. Isa. 27:10 is part of a theological reflection (vv. 7-11), which indeed is earlier than the so-called Isaiah Apocalypse, but is still postexilic. [16] The "fortified city," Jerusalem, is "solitary" (*badhadh*), "a deserted habitation" (*naveh meshullach*), "forsaken like the wilderness" (*ne'ezabh kammidhbar*). And in the style of the lament of a city that was once densely populated and respected among the nations, Lam. 1:1 says: Now "she sits alone (*yashebhah bhadhadh*), she has become like a widow." Rudolph appropriately observes: "this is not the 'splendid isolation' of Nu. 23:9 and Dt. 33:28[32:12], but the loneliness of a mother deprived of her children." [17]

These observations that *badhadh* means "loneliness," "solitude," for the first time in relatively late passages, that it is used in the genre of lament or at least is closely connected with it, and that it is applied to a city and a people in individualized form, indicate that we are dealing here with a figurative mode of expression. [18]

2. *Isolation of Individuals.* a. *badhadh* is also used of the isolation of individuals. First we may mention certain passages in which this word seems to be neutral. Concerning the approaching Assyrian army among other things, Isa. 14:31 says: "no one is alone (*bodhedh*) in his gathering places" [19] or "in his ranks." [20] At a casual glance the following passages also give the same impression. Ex. 24:2 contains the instruction to Moses that he alone is to come near to Yahweh. According to Jgs. 3:20, Eglon was sitting alone in his cool roof chamber when Ehud went to see him under the pretense of giving him a message from God, murdered him, and closed the doors upon him, which made Eglon's servants think that the king was relieving himself. And according to 1 K. 11:29, that Jeroboam I and Ahijah of Shiloh were alone made it possible

---

15 Weiser, *ATD,* XXIV, 259.
16 Eissfeldt, *The OT* (trans. 1965), 324ff.; Fohrer, *Introd OT* (trans. 1968), 369.
17 W. Rudolph, *KAT,* XVII, 211.
18 Cf. II.2.b.
19 Fohrer, *Jesaja*^{2}, I, 201.
20 Duhm, *Jesaja*^{5}, 125; cf. Seidel, 17; otherwise B. Kedar-Kopfstein, "A Note on Isaiah XIV,31," *Textus,* 2 (1962), 143-45.

Copyrighted material

for Ahijah to give the king a message from God. Consequently, man's solitude is the precondition for the reception or transmission of a divine revelation. But in the account of Jacob crossing the Jabbok, we also are told that while he remained behind alone a man wrestled with him, and finally this man blessed him (Gen. 32:25[24]).[21] The weirdness of this nocturnal attack on Jacob has left its impression on the solitude in this narrative and also throws light on preceding passages.

Abimelech's trembling question to David as he fled from Saul (1 S. 21:2[1]): "Why are you alone?" and Ahithophel's suggestion that he strike down David when he was alone (2 S. 17:2), indicate also that a man's solitude has something terrifying about it, that it is dangerous or "not good," as Gen. 2:18(J) puts it.

b. In the passages cited thus far, solitude conveys the idea that a person is by himself. But in other contexts it means that one is isolated or ejected from human fellowship, i.e., that he is destitute and lonely. According to Lev. 13:46, the leper is to dwell "alone in a habitation outside the camp," i.e., "alone and apart from the company of others."[22] The worshipper in the individual lament, Ps. 102, compares himself in v. 8(7) with a "lonely bird on the housetop."[23] Before this in v. 7(6) he compares himself with "a pelican (?) in the wilderness" (*midhbar*), and "an owl in the ruins" (*charabhoth*). As has been observed above,[24] OT writers evidently liked to describe solitude by using this kind of figure. But it is also clear that the loneliness of the plaintiff in Ps. 102 is due not only to a purely external separation from human fellowship (cf. v. 9[8]), but more strongly to an internal isolation (cf. v. 11[10]), so that Seidel is justified in speaking of an "experience of complete isolation."[25]

Again, Jeremiah complains in one of his confessions: "I did not sit in the company of merrymakers, nor did I rejoice; I sat alone (*badhadh yashabhti*), because thy hand was upon me, for thou hadst filled me with indignation" (15:17). His calling to proclaim Yahweh's word of judgment built this "dividing wall"[26] between him and the people, and this caused him to be alone. And while Jeremiah makes his experience of loneliness the subject of his lament, he gives expression to his deepest inner solitude, which manifests itself in strong protest against God, in fact in doubt and isolation from God (cf. 15:15,18). Lam. 3:28 also reflects the same sort of relationships. In the form of an individual lament, vv. 25-39 are a reflection on the meaning of suffering.[27] The style of this lament is closely connected with that of the Wisdom Literature,[28] and in vv. 28-30 it describes the attitude a man should have toward the yoke God has laid upon him. He is to

---

21 Cf. Seidel, 72.
22 M. Noth, *Leviticus. OTL* (trans. 1965), 106.
23 Cf. N. Airoldi, "Note critiche ai Salmi," *Aug*, 10 (1970), 174-180; H. Ringgren, *The Faith of the Psalmists* (1963), 25f.
24 II.1.b.
25 Seidel, 27.
26 Rudolph, *HAT*, 12 (³1968), 107.
27 Eissfeldt, 502.
28 Weiser, *ATD*, XVI, 328.

Copyrighted material

(continued from front flap)

Egyptian, Ethiopic, Ugaritic, and Northwest Semitic sources are surveyed, among others, as well as the Qumran texts and the Septuagint; and in cultures where no cognate exists, the authors often consider cognate ideas.

TDOT's emphasis, though, is on Hebrew terminology and on biblical usage. The contributors employ philology as well as form-critical and traditio-historical methods, with the aim of understanding the religious statements in the Old Testament. Extensive bibliographical information adds to the value of this reference work.

This English edition attempts to serve the needs of Old Testament students without the linguistic background of more advanced scholars; it does so, however, without sacrificing the needs of the latter. Ancient scripts (Hebrew, Greek, etc.) are regularly transliterated in a readable way, and meanings of foreign words are given in many cases where the meanings might be obvious to advanced scholars. Where the Hebrew text versification differs from that of English Bibles, the English verse appears in parentheses. Such features will help all earnest students of the Bible to avail themselves of the manifold theological insights contained in this monumental work.

G. JOHANNES BOTTERWECK was, until his death in 1981, professor of Old Testament and Catholic theology at the University of Bonn, Germany.

HELMER RINGGREN is professor of Old Testament interpretation at the University of Uppsala, Sweden.

JOHN T. WILLIS, translator of Volume I, is the Burton Coffman Distinguished Professor of Biblical Studies at Abilene Christian University, Abilene, Texas.

Copyrighted material

What reviewers have said about *TDOT:*

"The *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament* is a monumental contribution to the study of the Old Testament, and very highly recommended. No library can afford to be without it." — ***Hebrew Studies***

"Provides a much-needed resource into the language of the Old Testament, particularly as it relates to the ancient Near East. . . . A must for any serious student of the Old Testament." — ***Southwestern Journal of Theology***

"A tool that no Bible student can afford to ignore; it takes its place alongside Kittel as a classic reference work." — ***Christianity Today***

"Students of the Bible have cause for rejoicing as each volume of this scholarly work appears. . . . This 'theological dictionary' focuses on the etymology of Hebrew terms, then explores their cultural and historical contexts, finally suggesting their importance in a theological framework without espousing a particular denominational bias." — ***American Reference Books Annual***

"An important and interesting scholastic tool, essential for any library that serves serious Bible students, theological scholars, church-school teachers, pastors, or interested laypeople." — ***Choice***

"*[TDOT]* amasses a great deal of useful information (including bibliography) on the words dealt with, which most scholars would find difficult to ferret out on their own. . . . Clearly, no serious exegete of the Old Testament should overlook it." — ***Journal of the American Academy of Religion***

"This series will long remain a classic work, a storehouse of information, well organized and carefully judged and nuanced. Every major biblical library should possess it." — ***The Bible Today***

"Serious students of the Hebrew Bible will find this dictionary a valuable resource." — ***Journal of Biblical Literature***

ISBN 0-8028-2325-4

Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.
Grand Rapids/Cambridge